

OXFORD

ALBION & JERUSALEM

*The Anglo-Jewish Community in the
Post-Emancipation Era 1858–1887*



MICHAEL CLARK

ALBION AND JERUSALEM

OXFORD HISTORICAL MONOGRAPHS

Editors

P. CLAVIN R. J. W. EVANS

L. GOLDMAN J. ROBERTSON R. SERVICE

P. A. SLACK B. WARD-PERKINS

J. L. WATTS

Albion and Jerusalem

*The Anglo-Jewish Community in the
Post-Emancipation Era, 1858–1887*

MICHAEL CLARK

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford ox2 6DP

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide in

Oxford New York

Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi

Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi

New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in

Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece

Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan Poland Portugal Singapore

South Korea Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press
in the UK and in certain other countries

Published in the United States
by Oxford University Press Inc., New York

© Michael Clark 2009

The moral rights of the authors have been asserted
Database right Oxford University Press (maker)

First published 2009

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press,
or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate
reprographics rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction
outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department,
Oxford University Press, at the address above

You must not circulate this book in any other binding or cover
and you must impose the same condition on any acquirer

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data

Clark, Michael, D. Phil.

Albion and Jerusalem : the Anglo-Jewish community in the post-emancipation era /
Michael Clark.

p. cm. — (Oxford historical monographs)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-19-956234-3

1. Jews—Great Britain—Identity. 2. Jews—Great Britain—Politics and
government—19th century. 3. Board of Deputies of British Jews—History—19th
century. 4. Judaism—Great Britain—History—19th century. 5. Social integration—
Great Britain. 6. Great Britain—Ethnic relations. I. Title.

DS135.E5C53 2009

305.892'4042—dc22

2008042107

Typeset by Laserwords Private Limited, Chennai, India

Printed in Great Britain
on acid-free paper by
the MPG Books Group

ISBN 978-0-19-956234-3

1 3 5 7 9 10 8 6 4 2

Preface

This book was developed from my doctoral thesis. Both the book and the thesis explore various historical themes that have interested me since my early undergraduate days: identity formation; minority–majority relationships; toleration and persecution; acculturation and integration; and cultural choice.

My particular interest in this period of Anglo-Jewish history and, indeed, the community itself was stimulated when investigating reactions to the mass immigration of Russian Jews to Britain in the late nineteenth century and the subsequent reception of German Jewish refugees in the 1930s. The indigenous British Jewish community treated these immigrants with a mixture of sympathy and brotherly affection on the one hand and cultural resentment and paranoia on the other—an ambivalence that seemed to me to reflect deeper contradictions inherent in the minority's understanding of their identity and perceived position in British society. Investigating further during a Master's dissertation, I tentatively traced the roots of this reaction back to the events of Jewish emancipation in Britain—the formal admission of Jews to the status of legally equal citizens—and the idea for a thesis was born.

With my thesis and then this book I wanted to elucidate what happened, and more fundamentally why, during emancipation that so affected modern Jewish identity in this country; as well as comprehending the particular context within which this occurred: the politics, religion, and society of mid/late nineteenth-century Britain. Emancipation, a well-studied subject in relation to many European Jewries, has been overlooked in Britain, and one factor of interest was simply the greater exploration of a time crucial to the formation of modern Anglo-Jewish identity and, also, the modern Jewish community—many of the minority's central institutions were constructed at this time. A particular thematic interest, which became increasingly central over the course of research, was the fundamental ambiguity of many of the issues involved—the opportunities and dangers that modernity and identity definition presented, often simultaneously, to a minority community, and how this allowed the community, individuals, and outsiders to posit a variety of Anglo-Jewish positions and identities depending upon their circumstances and prejudices.

Although exploring a particular community at a particular time in its history, many of the themes in this book are not peculiar to Anglo-Jewry. Most obviously, they pose a useful comparison with the experiences of other Jewish communities, both in Europe and the United States, as well as those nascent at the time in the British Empire and Commonwealth. More widely, there is potential read across to other immigrant and minority histories, and, in turn, the reaction of British state and society to minorities and multiculturalism—subjects that speak directly to the broader concept of British identity. Indeed, the contemporary debate about modern British identity, and, notably, the scope and potential of its multicultural aspects, to some extent, continues to reflect certain issues outlined in this book.

It might be worth noting at this point that I am not Jewish. I do this out of no desire to proclaim my identity other than to explain that I have not grown up in any particular Anglo-Jewish milieu nor am affiliated to any particular form of Judaism, which, positively or negatively, might have influenced my understanding of the issues discussed in this book. I have approached this study as a curious and, hopefully, objective researcher, and, as such, I am grateful for the open and friendly reception I have received from the Anglo-Jewish community, particularly its historians and archivists, which has made this possible.

Many people, in fact, have contributed to the completion of this work and require my grateful acknowledgement.

First and foremost is my supervisor, turned advising editor, Dr Lawrence Goldman, who has patiently nurtured the project since its inception. It is in no small part due to his invaluable guidance, suggestions, and encouragement, not to mention his penetrating understanding of historical issues, that my thesis was finished at all, let alone converted into this book.

I am also indebted to a number of people for their valuable academic assistance and encouragement. Dr Abigail Green read major sections of the work when it was still a thesis and offered crucial advice and direction, as well as answering my queries, big and small, regarding Anglo-Jewry. Dr John Davis and Professor David Cesarani, my thesis examiners, were kind enough to recommend the work for publication whilst offering incisive comments on areas for improvement. Professor Cesarani deserves particular thanks, as he provided his extensive knowledge of Anglo-Jewish history to help guide my thinking both at the very

beginning of work on the thesis and after it had been submitted. Professor Bill Rubinstein was kind enough to evaluate the thesis for publication and offer advice on developing the work to this end. Thanks are due to Dr Bob Moore and Dr Timothy Baycroft for shaping and supporting the idea for my thesis when it was nothing but an abstract proposal. I am grateful to Dr Michael Jolles for not only allowing me to reproduce material from his research on Jewish MPs in an appendix, but for providing helpful guidance on facts and details, as well.

I am exceedingly grateful to the Arts and Humanities Research Council, whose funding over three years made this project possible in the first place.

Archivists and librarians at numerous institutions have assisted my research. I would especially like to thank: Professor Chris Woolgar and Ms Karen Roberston at the University of Southampton Library's Special Collections, who were always very helpful and friendly in the face of my numerous requests; staff at The Rothschild Archive, London, for providing me with valuable help in locating useful items; the staff at the London Metropolitan Archives, British Library and National Archives who provided repeated access to a great quantity of data; and Miss Miriam Rodrigues-Pereira, who was kind enough to work late in order to help me investigate the records of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews' Congregation. The staff of the Bodleian Library require special mention for their years of patient assistance.

For kindly permitting access to their archives and records I would like to acknowledge and thank: the Anglo-Jewish Association; the Board of Deputies of British Jews; the Bodleian Library, University of Oxford; the British Library; the Centre for Buckinghamshire Studies, the Church's Ministry among the Jews; Greenwich Heritage Centre; the London Beth Din; London School of Jewish Studies, the the National Trust; the Office of the Chief Rabbinate; the Rothschild Archive, London; Southwark Local History Library; the Spanish and Portuguese Jews' Congregation; the Syndics of Cambridge University Library; UCL Library Services, Special Collections; the United Synagogue; the University of Southampton Library; and the West London Synagogue.

I would like to thank the Yale Center for British Art for permission to reproduce the cover image.

Last, but by no means least, I need to acknowledge the invaluable and ever-present support and love of my family, and Fiona—without which this book would not have been possible.

M.C.
London
September 2008

Contents

<i>Abbreviations</i>	x
Introduction: Emancipation and the Modern Jewish Identity	1
1. Establishment and Emancipation: The Formation of Anglo-Jewish Identity, 1656–1858	26
2. Position and Politics: The First Jewish MPs	50
3. Representation, Coordination, and Civilization: The Board of Deputies of British Jews and Communal Government	109
4. Faith and Form: Anglo-Jewish Religion	170
5. Immigrants and Exhibitions: Expanding the Boundaries of British Jewry	224
Conclusion: Post-Emancipation Anglo-Jewry	256
Appendix 1. Jews Elected to Parliament	265
Appendix 2. Synagogue Statistics at the Board of Deputies	268
Appendix 3. Post-Emancipation Deputies and their Attendance	269
<i>Glossary</i>	279
<i>Bibliography</i>	281
<i>Index</i>	303

Abbreviations

AIU	Alliance Israélite Universelle
AJA	Anglo-Jewish Association
BDAR	Board of Deputies Annual Report
CFC	Conjoint Foreign Committee of the Board of Deputies and Anglo-Jewish Association
JBG	Jewish Board of Guardians
<i>JC</i>	<i>Jewish Chronicle</i>
JFS	Jews' Free School
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Jewish Journal of Sociology</i>
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Jewish Social Studies</i>
<i>JW</i>	<i>Jewish World</i>
LMA	London Metropolitan Archives
LPC	Law, Parliamentary, and General Purposes Committee of the Board of Deputies
MBBD	Minute Book of the Board of Deputies
<i>TJHSE</i>	<i>Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England</i>
USP	United Synagogue Papers
USyn	United Synagogue
<i>VJ</i>	<i>Voice of Jacob</i>

That we also may be like all the nations; and that our king may
judge us,
and go out before us . . .

1 Samuel 8.20

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction

Emancipation and the Modern Jewish Identity

I

Jewish identity is an elusive concept. Unique among modern definitions, it resists all historical categories and cannot be fitted into general models. There is a Jewish 'non-classifiability'.¹ Standard schemes of nation, race, and creed are insufficient to delineate what Freud termed the 'innere Identität'.² Manifest in the individual consciousness and expressible at a collective or international level, Jewish identity yet remains a conundrum.³ Blending various elements in a multitude of combinations, Jews are a group without a single foundation, a heterogeneous linking of the non-identical.⁴ Levels of intensity range across an existential gulf. The diffuse ambivalence of Jewishness embraces a gamut from assimilated and apostatized to separatist and national; either end of this identity continuum having no contiguous characteristics with the other. A mass of confusion therefore exists regarding self and group definition; what one Jew constitutes as identity is often dissimilar, perhaps even antithetical to another's construct. The resulting psychological issues often add a further problematic to Jewish identity. Isaiah Berlin talked of the 'very doubt' being 'unbearable'.⁵ Unable to locate themselves, to harmonize their presence, Jews could suffer from cognitive dissonance and might

¹ M. Buber, 'The Jews in the World' (1934), in idem, *Israel and the World: Essays in a Time of Crisis* (New York, 1948), 168.

² S. Whitfield, 'Enigmas of Modern Jewish Identity', *Jewish Social Studies*, 8/2–3 (Winter/Spring 2002), 162. Freud made this statement in a seemingly offhand remark to the *B'nai B'rith* in Vienna in 1926.

³ M. Meyer, *Jewish Identity in the Modern World* (London, 1990), 4.

⁴ J. Steyn, *The Jew: Assumptions of Identity* (London, 1999), 18.

⁵ I. Berlin, 'Benjamin Disraeli, Karl Marx and the Search for Identity', in idem, *Against the Current: Essays in the History of Ideas*, ed. H. Hardy (London, 1979), 275.

become insecure in their self-understanding. For both the Jew and the non-Jew living beside him this generated what Zygmunt Bauman describes as ‘the great fear of modern life . . . that of undetermination, unclarity, uncertainty—in other words, ambivalence’.⁶ Historically this has led to efforts, from both inside and out, at anchoring Jews, at incorporating them within established criteria and providing recognizable boundaries to their ‘boundary-transgressing persona’.⁷ This work examines one such period of formation and change within Jewish identity.

The notion of identity is one of the most ill defined in historians’ terminology. Erik Erikson suggested identity as a category linking the psychological growth of individual persons with the norms of society, but admitted the concept remained ‘a term for something as unfathomable as it is all-pervasive’.⁸ This book therefore avoids employing a strict understanding of the term. Instead, it takes a broad sweep, regarding identity as a complex and amorphous entity, observable through the interconnected range of characteristics, opinions, and attitudes exhibited by both individuals and groups within the multitude of circumstances that comprise modern society.⁹ Understanding identity to be thus a construct, and often a dynamic one, formed from a mixture of choices embedded within historically contingent circumstances and operating within inherited frameworks, this work analyses the nature of Jewish existence in a particular situation, at a particular time, and under particular conditions, delineating the themes and influences that determined and comprised Jewish definition in Britain during the post-emancipation era, 1858–87. This historical period is established on one side, rather obviously, by the achievement of Jewish emancipation, and on the other by the holding of the Anglo-Jewish Exhibition. This event, in the same year as Victoria’s jubilee, was both an encomium and, as it would transpire, a eulogy to the emancipatory ideals that had dominated Anglo-Jewish life for the past thirty years but were subtly altering under the impact of

⁶ Z. Bauman, ‘Allo-Semitism: Premodern, Modern, Postmodern’, in B. Cheyette and L. Marcus (eds.), *Modernity, Culture and ‘the Jew’* (Cambridge, 1998), 149.

⁷ D. Feldman, ‘Was Modernity Good for the Jews?’, in Cheyette and Marcus (eds.), *Modernity, Culture*, 178.

⁸ Quoted in Meyer, *Jewish Identity*, 5.

⁹ For more discussion of these ideas see Whitfield, ‘Enigmas’, 165; and B. Lammers, ‘A Superior Kind of English: Jewish Ethnicity and English Identity in London’s East End, 1905–39’ (Ph.D. thesis, State University of New Jersey, Oct. 1997), 11.

mass immigration, rising prejudice, and the concomitant emergence of political Zionism.

These Jewish identity issues were (and are) a product of modernity. For Jews in medieval and early modern Europe, the question of their definition was unproblematic. Centuries of particularity and exclusion had fused Jewish religion, nationality, and ethnicity into a self-sufficient identity. Jews viewed themselves—and were viewed by others—as a distinct and separate people. Links between Jewish and non-Jewish society were primarily instrumental and there was little neutral ideological ground between them to facilitate greater integration.¹⁰ Although the ‘dispersal of the Jewish communities throughout the world invariably brought both plain people and intellectuals into relation with most of the historic peoples and their culture’, Talmudic Judaism was able to accommodate itself to a variety of civilizations whilst preserving its historical continuity.¹¹ This Jewish existence was secure and constant, as it had been for generations. The political, economic, and social consequences of European states’ transition to modern forms—the ‘melting of solids’ into ‘liquid modernity’—destroyed this automatic Jewish identification.¹²

Under the Enlightenment’s aegis, belief in rationality and human progress, elevating science and philosophy at the expense of religion, transformed European societies over the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.¹³ Industrialization and urbanization took place as corporate distinctions were abolished; secularization increased as the centrality of religion declined; civil and bourgeois society developed as hierarchies loosened and wealth created new groupings; and more centralized, bureaucratic, and often representative government organized to mediate these other changes.¹⁴ These alterations and their triumphant liberal

¹⁰ T. Endelman, ‘Making Jews Modern: Some Jewish and Gentile Misunderstandings in the Age of Emancipation’, in M. Raphael (ed.), *What is Modern about the Modern Jewish Experience?* (Williamsburg, Va., 1997), 18–19, and Meyer, *Jewish Identity*, 12.

¹¹ L. Schwarz, ‘Introduction: Historians to the Reader’, in idem (ed.), *Great Ages and Ideas of the Jewish People* (New York, 1956), p. xxiv, and S. Baron, ‘The Modern Age’, in Schwarz, *Great Ages*, 337.

¹² Z. Bauman, *Liquid Modernity* (Cambridge, 2000), 6, 15.

¹³ D. Sorkin, ‘Jewish Emancipation in Central and Western Europe in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries’, in D. Englander (ed.), *The Jewish Enigma: An Enduring People* (Milton Keynes, 1992), 81–2.

¹⁴ D. Sorkin, ‘Port Jews and the Three Regions of Emancipation’, in D. Cesarani (ed.), *Port Jews: Jewish Communities in Cosmopolitan Maritime Trading Centres, 1550–1950* (London, 2002), 37, and Feldman, ‘Was Modernity Good for the Jews?’, 171.

justifications necessarily included the Jews.¹⁵ 'The modern state, especially the democratic state, could be established only after the abolition of the corporate distinctions and by the substitution of the egalitarian for the corporate structure of society.'¹⁶ In these circumstances it would have been an 'outright anachronism' for new nation states and individualistic societies to allow Jews to remain separate and autonomous.¹⁷ A similar reconstitution was therefore required of them: they had to adapt to modern times. Emancipation was the mechanism by which the transference of Jewish identity occurred. Emancipation removed Jews from their defined position, relocated them within the national collective, and provided access to modern ideas and conditions: legal equality, civil participation, economic freedom, and individuality.¹⁸ Emancipation, as Salo W. Baron termed it, was 'the great experiment in both general and Jewish history'.¹⁹

The impact upon Jewish identity was revolutionary. Multiple components previously beyond Jewish boundaries intruded upon their identification and overturned its former existential basis grounded in the enforceability of tradition.²⁰ Jewishness became only a part of Jews' sense of self.²¹ It was now to be combined with other components: national, political, socio-economic, and limited increasingly—as Gentile society stipulated—to the religious orbit. Bereft of their former self-validation and now judging themselves by non-Jewish standards, this reduction also made Jews 'intimately alive' to others' opinions of them and, therefore, sensitive to their criticism.²² Emancipation made Jews self-conscious of their (negatively perceived) differences and anomalies, creating what Nietzsche termed a *ressentiment*-prone situation. This, as developed by Max Scheler, 'refers to a psychological state resulting from suppressed feelings of envy and hatred (existential envy) and

¹⁵ Sorkin, 'Jewish Emancipation', 108.

¹⁶ Baron, 'Modern Age', 317.

¹⁷ Endelman, 'Making Jews Modern', 19.

¹⁸ P. Birnbaum and I. Katznelson, 'Emancipation and the Liberal Offer', in *idem* (eds.), *Paths of Emancipation: Jews, States and Citizenship* (Chichester, 1995), 4. Care must be taken, of course, not to establish too dichotomous a split between tradition and modernity—the transition varied considerably in form, pace, and extent.

¹⁹ Baron, 'Modern Age', 315.

²⁰ J. Katz, 'Introduction', in *idem* (ed.), *Towards Modernity: The European Jewish Model* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1987), 2.

²¹ T. Endelman, *The Jews of Georgian England, 1714–1830: Tradition and Change in a Liberal Society* (Philadelphia, 1979), 4.

²² T. Endelman, 'Jewish Self-Hatred in Britain and Germany', in M. Brenner, R. Liedtke, and D. Rechter (eds.), *Two Nations: British and German Jews in Comparative Perspective* (Tübingen, 1999), 337.

the impossibility of satisfying these feelings'. *Ressentiment* may occur when a perceived equality exists between the subject and the object of envy, so that in principle they are interchangeable but in reality the inequality that exists precludes the practical achievement of the theoretically existing equality.²³ This often results in a 'transvaluation of values', whereby the originally supreme values of a group are denigrated and replaced by exterior notions that were formerly unimportant or even negative.²⁴ Such a condition became widespread among European Jews undergoing emancipation and led in varying degrees to the abandonment of Jewish cultural markers and constituents.²⁵ In such a manner 'European emancipation presented Jewry with its most serious crisis of definition since the birth of rabbinic Judaism'.²⁶ The entirety of Jewish existence, and, indeed, that very existence itself, was questioned and challenged by the logic of equality. According to P. Birnbaum and I. Katznelson:

As Jews traversed paths to emancipation, their new condition as members of voluntary communities confronted them with choices that functioned as solvents to dissolve pre-emancipation patterns of Jewish solidarity. These options were concerned both with how to try and engage the wider non-Jewish world in all its dimensions, and about how to be Jewish in the circumstances of emancipation; that is, how to define the character of theological Judaism, the social organisation of Jewry, and the qualities of Jewishness as a way of life.²⁷

Unsure and divided regarding both the viability and desirability of settling these questions in any particular direction, Jews encountered 'a multiplicity of conflicting forces interacting in unpredictable ways' as they sought to define themselves.²⁸ Ambivalence became central to modern Jewish existence.

With such an impact emancipation has become a dominant theme in modern Jewish history. The tempestuous transition from tradition to modernity has been the leitmotif of modern Jewish life, according to

²³ L. Greenfeld, *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity* (London, 1992), 15–16.

²⁴ *Ibid.* 16.

²⁵ Z. Gitelman, 'The Decline of the Diaspora Jewish Nation: Boundaries, Content, and Jewish Identity', *JSS* 4/2 (Winter 1998), 125.

²⁶ J. Sacks, *One People? Tradition, Modernity, and Jewish Unity* (London, 1993), p. viii.

²⁷ Birnbaum and Katznelson, 'Emancipation', 11.

²⁸ J. Frankel, 'Assimilation and the Jews in Nineteenth-Century Europe: Towards a New Historiography', in J. Frankel and S. Zipperstein (eds.), *Assimilation and Community: The Jews in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Cambridge, 1992), 31.

Chief Rabbi Jonathan Sacks.²⁹ Whilst central, however, emancipation's effect upon European Jews has been far from uniform. The removal of legal impediments to Jews' participation and their subsequent internal and external transformations were not a unitary or singular experience. Emancipation was a 'multi-layered process' with a 'plurality of passages'.³⁰ It occurred in different states at different times and under a variety of conditions, all of which conduced to individualize the Jewish route to modernity in each of its national contexts. Appreciating these differences, several methodological commonalities are apparent and have led to 'types' of emancipation being identified by historians. Two basic categories exist: the revolutionary and the reformist or tutelary. The originator and paradigm of the revolutionary approach was France, where in 1791, under the influence of *liberté, égalité et fraternité*, Jews were automatically granted all the rights of French citizens.³¹ Successful revolutionary and Napoleonic armies then disseminated this procedure across significant areas of Western Europe: Dutch Jewry, for instance, was accorded full equality under French rule in 1796.³² Emancipation in Germany, on the other hand, already uneven and partial due to the fragmentary nature of its various polities, is often cited as exemplifying the tutelary method. Protracted in application, this approach witnessed incremental advances in Jewish rights, with the possibility of occasional reverses, based upon a contractual, quid pro quo arrangement requiring concomitant Jewish assimilation.³³ Werner Mosse has suggested four broad stages in German Jews' 'tortuous and thorny path' to emancipation: 1781–1815, where initial debate accompanied an attempted pan-German solution through the Congress of Vienna; followed by 1815–47, which witnessed retrograde measures and a retreat from equality; this was briefly succeeded in 1848–9 by another failed effort at general emancipation; and the final phase 1849–71 of gradual advance eventually completed by unification.³⁴

²⁹ Sacks, *One People?*, p. x.

³⁰ Birnbaum and Katznelson, 'Emancipation', 10–11.

³¹ F. Malino, *The Sephardic Jews of Bordeaux: Assimilation and Emancipation in Revolutionary and Napoleonic France* (Tuscaloosa, Ala., 1978), 55.

³² J. Michman, *Dutch Jewry during the Emancipation Period, 1787–1815* (Amsterdam, 1995), 23–5.

³³ M. Meyer, 'Introduction', in idem (ed.), *German-Jewish History in Modern Times: Emancipation and Acculturation: 1780–1871*, 4 vols. (Chichester, 1997), ii. 1–3.

³⁴ W. Mosse, 'From Schutzjuden to Deutsche Staatsbürger Jüdischen Glaubens: The Long and Bumpy Road of Jewish Emancipation in Germany', in Birnbaum and Katznelson (eds.), *Paths of Emancipation*, 60; and see R. Rürup, 'The Tortuous and

These two generalized categories are obvious simplifications of a complex process and their applications were far from straightforward or exclusive. Under Napoleon the French employed reformist tactics, withdrawing certain Jewish rights to encourage greater integration, whereas many German states first implemented emancipatory measures in response to French victories or following their own revolutions of 1848. Some historians also caution that this dualistic conception is centred upon Western Europe and therefore chronologically limited to its periodization of approximately 1770–1870. Eastern Europe, where the Jewish and non-Jewish adaptation to modernity was considerably different and often much later—Jews in the Russian Empire gained few rights before being emancipated after the February 1917 revolution and, consequently, non-traditional forms of Jewishness were more limited—is often excluded from analyses of emancipation, despite containing the vast majority of European Jews.³⁵ This has prompted David Sorkin to develop a more comprehensive formula incorporating the whole continent and a much wider timeframe. Beginning in 1654 when Amsterdam Jews gained rights as burghers and concluding with the 1919 signing of the minority rights treaty, Sorkin's assessment highlights four overlapping but not necessarily sequential gradations of status through which Jewish communities might pass en route to full emancipation.³⁶ This appreciation, recognizing different types of equality yet locating them all within a generalized movement, adds a necessary subtlety to the study of Jewish equality. It is certainly useful in the British context, which began a century before Central Europe's and contained many singular features, as will be discussed further in Chapter 1.³⁷

The manifold circumstances of emancipation elicited a corresponding multiplicity of Jewish reactions. Jews were far from passive recipients of modernity and their responses to the possibilities of equality determined to a great extent the future contours of Jewish existence in that

Thorny Path to Legal Equality: 'Jew Laws' and Emancipatory Legislation in Germany from the Late Eighteenth Century', *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook*, 31 (1986).

³⁵ B. Pinkus, *The Jews of the Soviet Union: The History of a National Minority* (Cambridge, 1988), 22–39.

³⁶ Sorkin, 'Port Jews', 35–40. The four stages Sorkin proposes are: toleration; civil inclusion; partial emancipation; and full emancipation.

³⁷ Sorkin's conception also allows the Sephardic experience to be adequately accommodated. These Jews encountered unique forms of toleration and modernity, often earlier than most other Jews, but appear only briefly and sporadically in most historical accounts as they fall outside typical legal conceptions.

state. In France, for example, in the civilly conscious atmosphere of the Revolution, Jews explicitly bargained with the state to reduce their separation and promote inclusion, whereas in Russia, downtrodden and unable to initiate dialogue in a closed society, Jews increasingly turned to radical and revolutionary solutions.³⁸ In respect to such responses, it is not so much the Western experience but more specifically that of German Jewry that has been advanced as paradigmatic. Formulating the most intellectually sophisticated of European Jewish adaptations, German Jews did develop several seminal movements. Modern interpretations of Judaism from the neo-Orthodoxy of Sampson Raphael Hirsch to the ultra-Reform of Samuel Holdheim, alongside scholarly movements examining Jewishness, such as *Wissenschaft des Judentums*, were born in Germany and would go on to alter Jewish identity around the world.³⁹ More crucially, the revolutionary thinking underpinning these new definitions had first been articulated in Berlin. In 1783 Moses Mendelssohn sparked the *Haskalah* with his publication *Jerusalem or on Religious Power and Judaism*, the first attempt to reconcile Judaism and rationality, and thereby justify a modern and Jewish existence.⁴⁰ Jacob Katz claims, 'Mendelssohn's contribution became of decisive importance; due to him Jewish aspirations to have access to non-Jewish society were not simply displayed in practice, as in England, but carried out under the cover of intellectual vindication.'⁴¹ The German example was undoubtedly the most cerebrally impressive of transitions but, as Katz himself admits, other Jews, notably the English, did not require such theoretical assistance. Operating under different conditions Anglo-Jewry pursued a very different transforming effort, gradually absorbing aspects of modernity from their more open environment and eschewing the cognitive effort German Jewry utilized. Moreover, as Todd Endelman has emphasized, socio-economic disparities within the same national setting could lead to radically divergent experiences: Jews 'did not enter the modern world like a well-disciplined army . . . The dual processes of acculturation and integration were acted out in countless thousands of private acts and encounters, mostly but not entirely unrecorded and

³⁸ J. Berkovitz, *The Shaping of Jewish Identity in Nineteenth-Century France* (Detroit, 1989), 72, 78–82, and Pinkus, *The Jews*, 39–45.

³⁹ M. Meyer, 'Jewish Self-Understanding', in idem (ed.), *German-Jewish History*, i. 132–5.

⁴⁰ M. Mendelssohn, *Jerusalem or on Religious Power and Judaism*, trans. A. Arkush (London, 1983).

⁴¹ Katz, 'Introduction', 11.

unobserved, far from the limelight of public discussion.⁴² No single model of Jewish transition could be relevant to all European Jews considering such national and individual particularities. Most historians now accept that the German Jewish tradition cannot be viewed as typical of Jewish adaptation elsewhere.⁴³ This national uniqueness has become a further divisive factor within modern Jewish identity. Traditionally, Jewish definition was universal and transnational, but as a consequence of emancipation it became context bound and state specific. It is in regard to the British situation that this work seeks to analyse and outline the nature of one such form of Jewish identity.

II

‘Jewish emancipation in England was by no means precocious.’⁴⁴ Equality came to the Jews of Britain in a piecemeal fashion. The process lacked an overtly tutelary logic but was certainly characterized by gradual reform over a period of nearly thirty years: 1830–58. In 1833 the first Jew was admitted to the bar; 1835 saw Jews gain the vote; in 1837 the University of London dispensed with religious qualifications concerning degrees (Oxford and Cambridge were to do the same in 1854 and 1856, respectively); and in 1845 all municipal offices were opened to the minority.⁴⁵ The final right to be conceded was the symbolically significant ability of professing Jews to sit in Parliament.⁴⁶ From the first Jewish Relief Bill

⁴² T. Endelman, ‘The Chequered Career of “Jew” King: A Study in Anglo-Jewish Social History’, in F. Malino and D. Sorkin (eds.), *From East to West: Jews in Changing Europe, 1750–1870* (Oxford, 1990), 181.

⁴³ Feldman, ‘Was Modernity Good for the Jews?’, 178.

⁴⁴ D. Feldman, *Englishmen and Jews: Social Politics and Political Culture, 1840–1914* (London, 1994), 3.

⁴⁵ D. Katz, *The Jews in the History of England 1485–1850* (Oxford, 1994), 386–8.

⁴⁶ The July 1858 entry of Lionel de Rothschild into the Commons was not technically the end of Anglo-Jewry’s emancipation. The political compromise thrashed out between the Lords and Commons meant that it was possible to swear a modified and de-Christianized oath only in the lower House, and then only if the chamber approved such a move. Jews’ ability to sit as MPs was thus a matter of sufferance not right. Henriques describes this as ‘peculiarly consonant to the trend of English constitutional history’, seemingly ‘destitute of principle and innocent of logic, but it was sufficient to meet the difficulty which had actually arisen; its form moreover, was so clumsy that it was in a short time found to be necessary to amend it.’ See H. Henriques, *The Jews and the English Law* (Oxford, 1908), 297. An 1860 statute corrected this situation in the Commons but it was not until 1866 that the Parliamentary Oaths Act instituted undenominational admission procedures for both Houses and thus extended the principle to the Lords. The final acts

of 1830, this took some thirteen legislative attempts to enact; all save the first and last passed the Commons only to be rejected by the Lords. There were mitigating factors excusing this delay: in the early 1830s parliamentary reform dominated the agenda; in the late 1840s Chartism at home and revolutions abroad decreased receptivity to change; and the 1850 reinstatement of the Catholic hierarchy heightened religious tensions—to name a few.⁴⁷ There was little British Jews could do to advance the process. In comparison to many European countries, inured to written constitutions, and where progress was viewed through legalistic reforms, Jews in Britain, faced with the Anglo-Saxon tradition of unwritten laws, relied as much upon the ‘precedents set by life’ as ‘gradual enactments’ of legislation.⁴⁸ Anglo-Jews had long been allowed to participate in Britain’s civically construed nationalism. Quietly pursuing the extensive social and economic opportunities already available to them, Anglo-Jews sought to demonstrate their integration in a manner practically designed to include them in English cultural thought, which remained determinedly universalistic and monogenetic.⁴⁹

This adaptation, and Anglo-Jewish emancipation in general, has not received due historiographical consideration. Few works, most of which are now rather aged, have addressed the subject directly. The two most substantial are M. Salbstein, *The Emancipation of the Jews in Britain: The Question of the Admission of the Jews to Parliament, 1828–1860* and A. Gilam, *The Emancipation of the Jews in England, 1830–1860*.⁵⁰ The former concentrates upon parliamentary debates and political action, while the later pays closer attention to the Jewish side; both usefully detail the proceedings and underline the major issues of

of legal equalization in Britain came in 1871 with the removal of religious tests for entry to higher degrees, fellowships, and offices at Oxford and Cambridge, and the Promissory Oaths Act removal of restrictions on Jews and Catholics holding certain offices of the Crown. Contemporaries, however, considered emancipation to have taken place in 1858 when Rothschild took his seat, and this book will, therefore, whilst appreciating these technicalities, also treat this year as marking the attainment of Jewish equality, as does most historiography.

⁴⁷ D. Cesarani, *The Jewish Chronicle and Anglo-Jewry, 1841–1991* (Cambridge, 1994), 20–1.

⁴⁸ Baron, ‘Modern Age’, 318.

⁴⁹ P. Mandler, ‘Race and “Nation” in Mid-Victorian Thought’, in S. Collini, R. Whatmore, and B. Young (eds.), *History, Religion and Culture: British Intellectual History, 1750–1950* (Cambridge, 2000), 225.

⁵⁰ M. Salbstein, *The Emancipation of the Jews in Britain: The Question of the Admission of the Jews to Parliament, 1828–1860* (London, 1982) and A. Gilam, *The Emancipation of the Jews in England, 1830–1860* (London, 1982).

emancipation in England. However, both now appear unsophisticated in light of more recent historiography, which provides a more critical and analytical appraisal of Anglo-Jewry. Geoffrey Alderman's article 'English Jews or Jews of the English Persuasion? Reflections on the Emancipation of Anglo-Jewry' is the most recent work to directly address the topic in this new vein.⁵¹ Locating emancipation within the surrounding Jewish and Gentile contexts, it reveals the complex interplay of issues propelling and retarding the process, as well as highlighting the long-term implications these had upon the Jewish community. These conclusions were preceded by several articles of Israel Finestein's that first took note of internal Anglo-Jewish differences concerning equality; as well as U. Henriques's 'The Jewish Emancipation Controversy in Nineteenth-Century Britain', which assessed the campaign through vicissitudes of non-Jewish opinion.⁵²

The state of emancipation historiography regrettably reflects the general paucity of serious historical research upon the Anglo-Jewish community. Although the situation has greatly improved in the last couple of decades, both British and Jewish historians have tended to overlook the minority. In the British case Todd Endelman finds a 'benign neglect' that treats Jews superficially, as either victims or exemplars of other British themes—anti-alienism or the rise of finance capital, for instance—whilst ignoring their specific existence.⁵³ This 'breathtaking omission' he ascribes to the structural obstacle of the Jews' identity, which eludes easy definition 'and thus cannot be fitted comfortably into the standard categories of British historical writing'.⁵⁴ C. Richmond suggests that such classificatory difficulties are often compounded by British historians' conscious or unconscious desire to minimize the presence of minorities that may cast a poor light upon the general British situation, and thereby

⁵¹ G. Alderman, 'English Jews or Jews of the English Persuasion? Reflections on the Emancipation of Anglo-Jewry', in Birnbaum and Katznelson (eds.), *Paths of Emancipation*.

⁵² See I. Finestein, 'Some Modern Themes in the Emancipation Debate in Early Victorian England', in idem, *Jewish Society in Victorian England* (London, 1993); idem, 'Anglo-Jewish Opinion during the Struggle for Emancipation (1828–1858)', in idem, *Jewish Society*; idem, 'A Modern Examination of Macaulay's Case for the Civil Emancipation of the Jews', in idem, *Jewish Society*; idem, 'Jewish Emancipation in Victorian England: Self-Imposed Limits to Assimilation', in Frankel and Zipperstein (eds.), *Assimilation and Community*; and U. Henriques, 'The Jewish Emancipation Controversy in Nineteenth-Century Britain', *Past and Present*, 40 (July 1968).

⁵³ T. Endelman, *The Jews of Britain, 1656 to 2000* (London, 2002), 5.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.* 6–7.

detract from the portrayal of a tolerant and progressive British culture.⁵⁵

Similar reservations have contrived to exclude Anglo-Jewry from the attention of Jewish scholars. Once again, the British community does not fit the pattern. Comparatively undramatic, Anglo-Jewish history witnessed an absence of violence and turmoil that prevents the use of a familiar framework of analysis: the Jews as a persecuted minority.⁵⁶ A corresponding lack of internal communal disturbance, and hence the dramatic cultural or intellectual innovation that tended to occasion this, has led historians who examine Jewish modernization in terms of the creation of new ideologies to also marginalize Anglo-Jewry.⁵⁷ Even the possibility that British Jews, with their relatively untroubled integration and one of the longest undisturbed Jewish experiences of modern times, may represent a paradigm, or at least an interesting case study, of Jewish toleration and successful Diaspora life has not elicited historical attention. The East European school of Jewish history, pessimistic regarding modernity's impact upon the Jews and believing that Jewishness survived best in the less-affected communities of the East, has little sympathy for this perspective. This school, with its emphasis upon the Jewish people's cultural and political autonomy, attained the status of a 'great orthodoxy' after the Holocaust and the creation of the state of Israel, and long shifted Jewish historical interests away from the Anglo-Jewish condition.⁵⁸ On isolated occasions, such as the 1917 Balfour Declaration and the British Mandate in Palestine, British and general Jewish history have intersected and thrust Anglo-Jewry into the limelight.⁵⁹ However, for most Jewish historians the importance of such events lies more in their British context, the role of the power in the region and its attitudes towards Jewish settlement, as opposed to the actions of the community that coincidentally happened to be involved. All of these reasons have combined to make Anglo-Jewry something of the black sheep of European Jewish historiography.

Anglo-Jewish history developed from this background of dual neglect by its two constituent parts. Aware of its presumed exceptionalism

⁵⁵ C. Richmond, 'Englishness and Medieval Anglo-Jewry', in T. Kushner (ed.), *The Jewish Heritage in British History: Englishness and Jewishness* (London, 1992), 44.

⁵⁶ Endelman, *Jews of Britain*, 2.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.* 2–3.

⁵⁸ Feldman, 'Was Modernity Good for the Jews?', 174–5.

⁵⁹ D. Cesarani, 'Introduction', in *idem* (ed.), *The Making of Modern Anglo-Jewry* (Oxford, 1990), 1.

and proud of its staid experiences, communal historians adopted a celebratory and triumphalist outlook. Tapping into contemporary conceptions of British cultural success and superiority, early Anglo-Jewish historiography presented a narrative of the community that was highly Whiggish.⁶⁰ Appreciating the high degree of toleration the minority enjoyed in Britain, this history was founded upon an attitude described as 'meliorism': a central belief in the continuously positive evolution of Anglo-Jewish life, steadily assisted by the unique liberalism of Britain.⁶¹ Two interrelated themes dominated this writing. There was an assimilatory aim demonstrating the duration of Jews' settlement in Britain and their contribution to the host society, and an apologetic tendency that sanitized, usually by ignoring, discordant or insalubrious elements of Jewish existence.⁶² The product was a one-sided portrait emphasizing the harmony of Englishness and Jewishness by lauding the establishment of charities or the success of financial dynasties, whilst ignoring many realities of Jewish life, such as criminality, immigration, or anti-Semitism.⁶³ The other salient feature of this Anglo-Jewish writing was its unprofessionalism. The vast bulk of research was undertaken by amateurs, usually communal dignitaries or functionaries and often associated with the Jewish Historical Society of England.⁶⁴ This compounded the above problems, as, lacking suitable training and rather filio-pietistic in attitude, these amateur historians approached the subject with 'uncritical admiration'.⁶⁵

For decades the sole exponent of professional Anglo-Jewish study was the Oxford historian Cecil Roth, who was University Reader in Post-Biblical Jewish Studies. Unfortunately, Roth represented the apogee of Anglo-Jewish historical Whiggishness. Writing during the 'blackest era of Jewish history', Roth explicitly called for communal history to be used in defence of the Jewish image, in 'vindication of the Jew as

⁶⁰ D. Cesarani, 'Dual Heritage or Duel of Heritages? Englishness and Jewishness in the Heritage Industry', in Kushner (ed.), *The Jewish Heritage*, 37. Cesarani observes in mitigation that to some extent Anglo-Jewish historians were merely reflecting the unquestioning patriotism and adulation of institutions characteristic of many contemporary historians, such as J. B. Seeley, J. R. Green, or Edward Freeman.

⁶¹ W. Rubinstein, 'The Decline and Fall of Anglo-Jewry?', *Jewish Historical Studies*, 38 (2002), 16.

⁶² Cesarani, 'Introduction', 2.

⁶³ T. Endelman, 'The Englishness of Jewish Modernity in England', in Katz (ed.), *Toward Modernity*, 91.

⁶⁴ Endelman, *Jews of Britain*, 4–5.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.* 5, and L. Gartner, 'A Quarter Century of Anglo-Jewish Historiography', *JSS* 48/2 (Spring 1986), 106.

an Englishman'.⁶⁶ Consequently, his research continued Anglo-Jews' partisan presentations focusing upon integration, success, and toleration. His *A History of the Jews in England*, written in 1941, ends its analysis in 1858 with the achievement of emancipation—implying that afterwards Jews ceased to have a separate history and thus required no specific study.⁶⁷ The following eighty years, some of the most turbulent and important in Anglo-Jewry's existence, are surveyed in a mere four pages, most of which are spent eulogizing English society before terminating with a paragraph encapsulating the hagiographic conceptions of such historiography:

In this happy land they have attained a measure of freedom (and thereby of collaboration) which has been the case in scarcely any other. That this has been possible is due in no slight measure to the process of Anglo-Jewish history—a gradual acceptance based on common sense rather than on doctrine, consolidating itself slowly but surely, and never outstripping public opinion. Hence it has been possible for the English Jews to exemplify how men can enter a society by methods other than descent, and to absorb traditions which are not those of their physical ancestors.⁶⁸

This tradition dominated the minority's historiography until the 1970s. A slackening had slowly occurred throughout the 1960s, sparked by Lloyd Gartner's seminal work *The Jewish Immigrant in England 1870–1914*, which brought American familiarity with intra-Jewish pluralism to bear upon the stifled British scene, but it was not until the late 1970s that transformations in British society facilitated its overthrow and the opening of Anglo-Jewish study.⁶⁹ A notable stimulus was the occurrence of mass immigration to Britain and the subsequent creation of a multi-ethnic society. Promoting interest in minority–majority relations and, more specifically, social and political policy regarding immigrant communities, this prompted an interest in historical precedents.⁷⁰ In tandem the contemporaneous revolution in historical thinking—legitimizing social history and a raft of more targeted thematic subjects: socialism, feminism, regionalism—was conducive to

⁶⁶ D. Katz, 'The Marginalisation of Early Modern Anglo-Jewish History', in Kushner (ed.), *The Jewish Heritage*, 61, and C. Roth, *The Jew as a European* (London, 1938), 3.

⁶⁷ C. Roth, *A History of the Jews in England* (Oxford, 1941).

⁶⁸ Cesarani, 'Introduction', 2, and Roth, *History*, 267.

⁶⁹ L. Gartner, *The Jewish Immigrant in England, 1870–1914* (London, 1960).

⁷⁰ D. Feldman, 'Jews in London, 1880–1914', in R. Samuel (ed.), *Patriotism: The Making and Unmaking of British National Identity*, 5 vols. (London, 1989), ii. 207.

exploring diversity, neglected narratives, and contentious issues.⁷¹ These phenomena filtered into Anglo-Jewish study and facilitated the investigation of previously taboo areas: as, for instance, in W. Fishman's *East End Jewish Radicals, 1875–1914*.⁷² Over the 1980s and 1990s, with more, younger, and increasingly professional attention, Anglo-Jewish studies has developed a more respectable historiography, engaged with all aspects of its experience, offering a variety of interpretational schools, and possessing areas of controversy.

Endelman has identified three themes in particular that, irrespective of topic or period, have been explored by this more critical research to reveal ignored features of the British Jewish experience: first, emphasis upon intra-communal conflict over the old consensualist model; second, reassessment of the nature and extent of British anti-Semitism; and third, in light of these, demonstration of the erosion of Jewish identity and interests.⁷³ In the first strand, the cohesiveness of Anglo-Jewry has been challenged by examination of various forms of internal stratification and division. Most recently contention has been centred upon the community's reception of Jewish immigrants, particularly those from Eastern Europe in the late nineteenth century. The division is between those who follow the 'minor orthodoxy' of Gartner that ethno-cultural bonds linked different Jews together despite minor differences and the conflict-exaggerating class analysis of historians such as Joseph Buckman, who adopts Marxist criteria to stress communal tensions.⁷⁴ Since the 1990s a more sophisticated trend recognizing the intersecting importance of both ethnicity and class to both Jewish solidarity and division has developed in the works of Bill Williams and David Feldman.⁷⁵ British anti-Semitism, studiously ignored by older historiography, had not provoked much interest from more general historians either.⁷⁶ Regarded as marginal, the long history of anti-Semitism in Britain had been

⁷¹ Endelman, *Jews of Britain*, 10, and Cesarani, 'Dual Heritage', 37.

⁷² W. Fishman, *East End Jewish Radicals, 1875–1914* (London, 1975).

⁷³ T. Endelman, 'English Jewish History', *Modern Judaism*, 11/1 (Feb. 1991), 92.

⁷⁴ Feldman, *Englishmen*, 144, and see J. Buckman, *Immigrants and the Class Struggle: The Jewish Immigrant in Leeds, 1880–1914* (Manchester, 1983).

⁷⁵ See Feldman, *Englishmen*; B. Williams, *The Making of Manchester Jewry, 1740–1875* (Manchester, 1985); and B. Williams, "'East and West': Class and Community in Manchester Jewry, 1850–1914", in Cesarani (ed.), *The Making*.

⁷⁶ Only two significant studies have been made of British anti-Semitism: G. Lebzelter, *Political Antisemitism in England, 1918–1939* (London, 1978) and C. Holmes, *Anti-Semitism in British Society, 1876–1939* (London, 1979). Holmes remains the standard work, although his efforts have been substantially augmented by more recent historiography that has illuminated several specific instances and types of prejudice in Britain;

surprisingly underestimated until recently.⁷⁷ Since the 1990s historians such as Williams, Feldman, Tony Kushner, David Cesarani, and Bryan Cheyette, often working with new evidence, have shifted the conceptual framework to highlight the extent of anti-Semitism in Britain.⁷⁸ Dispensing with the comparative analysis that facilitates the downplaying of English hostility, these historians have relocated prejudice within the British national context, revealing a distinctive form of hostility: 'the anti-Semitism of tolerance'. The toll this took upon the community forms the third theme of recent study. The above historians, to whom should be added Geoffrey Alderman, have identified a 'disabling compulsion among Jews to justify their emancipation and demonstrate that they were worthy British subjects'.⁷⁹ This, enforced by Britain's liberal yet homogeneous culture, they argue, coerced Anglo-Jewry into transcending their own cultural differences, to abnegate many aspects of Jewishness in an effort to conform to Britishness.⁸⁰

The current of recent historical work has not, of course, flowed constantly in this direction of critical enquiry. So pervasive was the original tradition that its influence can still be detected in recent research. The works of Vivian Lipman, Roth's heir, continued it most obviously, but more scholarly and forceful arguments in favour of an optimistic assessment have been advanced by William Rubinstein.⁸¹ Rubinstein feels there is a need to defend Roth's basic premisses, and his work offers a history remarkably free of anti-Semitism and admiring of British

see, for instance, T. Kushner and N. Valman (eds.), *Remembering Cable Street: Fascism and Anti-Fascism in British Society* (London, 2000).

⁷⁷ Richmond, 'Englishness', 57, and W. Rubinstein, 'The Jews of Britain, 1656–2000: A Review Article', *Jewish Journal of Sociology*, 44/1–2 (2002), 85.

⁷⁸ Endelman, 'English Jewish History', 99. See D. Cesarani, *Reporting Antisemitism: The Jewish Chronicle, 1879–1979*, Parkes Lecture (Southampton, 1993); B. Cheyette, 'The Other Self: Anglo-Jewish Fiction and the Representation of Jews in England, 1875–1905', in Cesarani (ed.), *The Making*; T. Kushner, 'The Impact of British Antisemitism, 1918–1945', in Cesarani (ed.), *The Making*; and B. Williams, 'The Antisemitism of Tolerance: Middle-Class Manchester and the Jews, 1870–1900', in A. Kidd and K. Roberts (eds.), *City, Class and Culture: Studies of Social Policy and Cultural Production in Victorian Manchester* (Manchester, 1985).

⁷⁹ D. Feldman, 'Jews and the State in Britain', in Brenner, Liedtke, and Rechter (eds.), *Two Nations*, 142; and see G. Alderman, *Modern British Jewry*, 2nd edn. (Oxford, 1998).

⁸⁰ B. Cheyette and N. Valman, 'Introduction: Liberalism and Antisemitism', in eadem (eds.), *The Image of the Jew in European Liberal Culture, 1789–1914* (London, 2004), 4.

⁸¹ V. Lipman, *Social History of the Jews in England, 1850–1950* (London, 1954); W. Rubinstein, *A History of the Jews in the English Speaking World: Great Britain* (Basingstoke, 1996).

inclusiveness.⁸² ‘Coinciding with the apogee of Victorian liberalism, the status of the Jews in England seemed to provide living evidence of the doctrine of progress and a mood of optimism.’⁸³ Although Rubenstein’s portrayal of a ‘benign *sonderweg*’ shifts the argument back too far in the other direction, it is a useful corrective to complete acceptance of the critical historiography.⁸⁴

Other historians have also sought to qualify the recent trend; they appreciate that its discoveries have been of immense value but cannot, any more than the older tendency, be taken as the full picture. Endelman observes also that whilst contextualization is valuable, the comparative is still a useful historical instrument concerning anti-Semitism and, as such, it demonstrates Britain as an unusually benevolent environment. The antagonism that existed should not, he feels, detract from the more remarkable examples of toleration and even support for Jewish particularity—in the form of legislative exemption or statutory backing for communal bodies; especially as the basic societal integration of Jews was never questioned.⁸⁵ Abigail Green in her work on the Jewish philanthropist and celebrity Sir Moses Montefiore warns against simplifying the Jew–Gentile relationship, noting that in a period, the late 1870s–1880s, when historians such as Feldman have traced the rise of mainstream anti-Jewish feeling, Montefiore’s public popularity paradoxically peaked, even though he represented (increasingly) an overtly Jewish figure.⁸⁶ Feldman himself admits: ‘It is clear that the ambition of modern states to purge themselves of ethnic, religious, linguistic and cultural diversity has been grossly overestimated.’⁸⁷ Thus, while the critical perspective remains strong, historiography has been moving towards a compromise. The work of Todd Endelman perhaps best encapsulates this balance.⁸⁸ Concentrated upon the less illustrious and less studied aspects of the community—the lower classes, criminals, and

⁸² Rubenstein, *History of the Jews*, 85, and Feldman, ‘Jews and the State’, 141.

⁸³ Rubenstein, *History of the Jews*, 89.

⁸⁴ R. Robertson, ‘The Representation of the Jews in British and German Literature: A Comparison’, in Brenner, Liedtke, and Rechter (eds.), *Two Nations*, 411.

⁸⁵ Endelman, ‘English Jewish History’, 101, and idem, ‘Making Jews Modern’, 26.

⁸⁶ A. Green, ‘Rethinking Sir Moses Montefiore: Religion, Nationhood and International Philanthropy in the Nineteenth Century’, *American Historical Review*, 110/3 (June 2005), 646–7.

⁸⁷ Feldman, ‘Was Modernity Good for the Jews?’, 176.

⁸⁸ See, for example, Endelman, ‘Chequered Career’; idem, ‘Communal Solidarity among the Jewish Elite of Victorian London’, *Victorian Studies*, 28 (1984–5); idem, *Jews in Georgian England*; idem, *Radical Assimilation in English Jewish History, 1656–1945* (Bloomington, Ind., 1990); and idem, *Jews of Britain*.

apostates—his research offers full opportunity to discover the manifold communal divisions, as well as the counteracting factors solidifying Jewry. The Anglo-Jewish experience is seen to be heterogeneous; a myriad of paths to modernity discernible, where some Jews encounter prejudice and some do not, where some relinquish their associations and some do not.⁸⁹

This blending of critical, realistic, and exceptional components, based around the varieties of Jewish existence, currently provides the most sophisticated level of Anglo-Jewish historiography. This book follows in this vein. Investigating the ‘constellation of interdependent factors’—intellectual, social, religious, political, and to a lesser extent economic—that formed British Jewry’s world, it examines both centrifugal and centripetal factors operating upon Jewish identity.⁹⁰ It engages with all three of the recent historiographical trends: although Jewish immigrants do not feature greatly due to periodization, discussion of dissolving or cementing issues within the community is prominent; while it does not set out to assess levels of anti-Semitism, the ability and nature of Jews’ access to and treatment by British society are crucial aspects; and the ramifications upon Jewish identity are at the centre of this study. Conceptions of Anglo-Jewry’s congenial situation and the effect of unique toleration upon their acculturation, such as were more popular in older writing, will also be assessed throughout.

With this approach, this book applies current historiographical understandings to a previously neglected era of Anglo-Jewish history: the immediate post-emancipation decades, 1858–87. Sandwiched between the more dramatic episodes of emancipation and the commencement of mass Jewish immigration, these years have often been overlooked by earlier historians, who used to consider them perhaps ‘the most benign period of Jewish life in Britain’.⁹¹ More recent historiography focusing upon the period 1870–1945 has touched upon the era, but its research has been confined primarily to features related to the Eastern European newcomers, and as such has not explored the time in depth or as a unit in itself. Yet as Cesarani has noted it was in these crucial decades that the issues and problems appearing from the 1880s onwards

⁸⁹ Endelman, ‘English Jewish History’, 100. Feldman also endorses the concept of multiple routes to Anglicization and acculturation: see Feldman, ‘Jews in London’, 208.

⁹⁰ S. Herman, *Jewish Identity: A Social Psychological Perspective* (London, 1977), 21.

⁹¹ Rubinstein, *History of the Jews*, 78.

were formed and initially expressed.⁹² Both he and Endelman have consequently called for greater study of the period and its impact upon Jewish existence.⁹³

Emancipation was not a panacea to Jewish questions but an enabler, providing Jews with the opportunity to participate equally.⁹⁴ Post-emancipation, the discussions about Jewish identity had to be realized in practice. The time was therefore one of the most formative in Anglo-Jewish history. Questions regarding Jews remained unsettled. The hyphenated Anglo-Jewish identity was being tested for the first time in this period, against the background of an expectant yet far from static British environment. Although less dramatic than some episodes, the decisions and events of these three decades were vitally important in determining the future of Anglo-Jewish existence. This work sets out to examine the Anglo-Jewish subculture of this time: to investigate their inter-faith and inter-ethnic dialogue with English state and society; to discover the identity boundaries created by and imposed upon them; and to analyse how Jews reconciled being a particular minority in a universalist world. Using the overarching framework of identity it seeks to delineate the impact emancipation had upon the nature of Jewish existence in Britain. In doing so, it explores questions of minority–majority relationships, acculturation, integration, subculture formation, and identity development within the British and Jewish context; as well as empirically illuminating the events of a neglected period.

III

In the discussion which follows, these themes are focused on the Anglo-Jewish elite—the leadership of the community. These Jews were a tight-knit and readily identifiable group, nicknamed the ‘Cousinhood’ by Chaim Bermant on account of their blood and financial interrelations, who dominated the formal and informal running of the community for most of the nineteenth century.⁹⁵ They were at the forefront of

⁹² D. Cesarani, ‘British Jews’, in R. Liedtke and S. Wendehorst (eds.), *The Emancipation of Catholics, Jews and Protestants: Minorities and the Nation State in Nineteenth Century Europe* (Manchester, 1999), 36.

⁹³ Endelman, ‘English Jewish History’, 104.

⁹⁴ Sorkin, ‘Port Jews’, 40.

⁹⁵ C. Bermant, *The Cousinhood: The Anglo-Jewish Gentry* (New York, 1971).

Anglo-Jewry's transition to modernity; publicly negotiating the terms of Jewish life, they pioneered trends of acculturation and provide the researcher with the most articulate example of Jewish identity. The group, small and self-perpetuating, directed all communal institutions and so also set the internal agenda for Jewish existence, as well as being able to determine the outward image presented. Investigating their attitudes and actions in the post-emancipation age therefore becomes crucial to understanding Anglo-Jewish identity and its interaction with non-Jewish environments. This has been undertaken, however, with the knowledge that no culture or community possesses a unitary identity. Inhabiting many different political, class, generational, or cultural contexts, functioning as individuals as well as group members, no single formulation could sufficiently contain all British Jews.⁹⁶ This work mentions a variety of Jewish groups—women, religious dissidents, working-class Jews, and provincials—not generally found among the elite leadership in an effort to more completely demonstrate Anglo-Jewish existence and as both contrast and support to the main focus. Immigrant Jews, in particular, especially those from Eastern Europe, would have diverged significantly from the pattern of the acculturated elite. Chapter 5 examines some of the differences these immigrants wrought upon the identity of the British community.

It has likewise been necessary to establish geographical limits to this work. This work, like much other historiography, centres overwhelmingly upon London and its Jewish residents. During the nineteenth century between one-half to two-thirds of all British Jews lived in the capital, and important Jewish persons and institutions were correspondingly concentrated there. Whilst provincial communities encountered different conditions and the London experience cannot be taken as representative, it was easily the most important example, and most contemporary debate regarding Jews was inevitably aimed at the Jews of London.⁹⁷ Considering location it is also essential for the historian of Anglo-Jewry to keep in mind the minority's context, the

⁹⁶ P. Hyman, 'Gender and the Shaping of Modern Jewish Identities', *JSS* 8/2–3 (Winter/Spring 2002), 153.

⁹⁷ Feldman, *Englishmen*, 16. It should be mentioned whilst discussing geography that this work, in line with conventional historiographical practice, will use the term Anglo-Jewry to refer to all Jews in Britain, unless specifically indicated in the text. The descriptions 'English', 'British', and 'Anglo' Jewry have also been used interchangeably, unless obviously designed to indicate a particular context, as they were by contemporaries.

so-called 'horizontal dimensions' of modern Jewish history.⁹⁸ By the mid-nineteenth century, 'Jews were so successfully integrated into so many areas of English life that to speak of the autonomous history of Victorian Anglo-Jewry is meaningless.'⁹⁹ Close attention is paid, therefore, to the complexities of the British situation within which Jews lived and operated. In doing so, as historians such as Feldman have demonstrated, the Anglo-Jewish experience can reveal new angles upon various aspects of British history.¹⁰⁰ This book attempts to modestly contribute to areas of British history that interact with the Jewish experience: such as, for instance, state and society's toleration of minorities, British culture's receptivity to deviant patterns, and levels of anti-Semitism.

A five-chapter structure has been adopted to accomplish these tasks. It comprises two smaller, parenthetical chapters, 1 and 5, and three interlinked but sociologically variant case studies. Chapter 1 is designed to offer background to the period, surveying historical knowledge of Anglo-Jewry's resettlement and their campaign to achieve emancipation. It establishes emancipation as a 'symbolic point of departure' for English Jews, not necessarily a hard-and-fast historical discontinuity but a milestone inaugurating a new phase, and thereby sets up the following analysis.¹⁰¹ The subsequent three chapters examine the impact of emancipation upon the community through a series of case studies, each of which employs original research to detail a different strand of the community's leadership. Chapter 2 investigates Jewish Members of Parliament. These individuals exercised the privilege that had come to represent Jewish equality and did so in the most British of environments, where their responsibilities to the community were ambiguous. Jewish MPs were at the forefront of realizing equality; their political decisions at party, local, national, and international level had wide repercussions upon Anglo-Jewry's identity and its perception by others. Chapter 3's focus is upon internal communal government, in particular the activities and operation of the Board of Deputies of British Jews. This quasi-democratic, quasi-oligarchic institution claimed sole responsibility for representing British Jews to the outside world, whilst also seeking to maintain a coherent group governed by a certain pattern of Jewish existence. Its success and failure in these endeavours reveal much about both the desired identity of a section of the Jewish elite and their

⁹⁸ Endelman, *Jews of Britain*, 11.

¹⁰⁰ Feldman, *Englishmen*, 12, 388.

⁹⁹ Katz, *The Jews*, 383.

¹⁰¹ Sorkin, 'Port Jews', 31.

ability to attain this persona; whilst the body's (and its opponents') considerable interaction with the British state discloses much about the polity's opinion of the minority. The subject of Chapter 4 is broader in scope, dealing with a more amorphous group of issues connected to Jewry's socio-cultural life. The main thrust is on the nature of the community's religiosity and how this fundamentally Jewish sphere adapted to Englishness. Sections deriving from this address the community's educational structure and the related issues of cultural achievement and language use, so as to examine the importance placed upon the transmission of Jewish tradition. The final chapter, 5, returns to the smaller, less empirical format. Examining alterations to the community's social and economic status during the 1880s, addressing the problem of escalating Jewish immigration and the perception of changes in their British environment, the chapter analyses the burgeoning of the community's historical consciousness to demonstrate the closure of this period of Anglo-Jewish experience.

Each main chapter contains specific historiographical information and mention of archival holdings relevant to it, but it is germane to briefly mention those sources that are of general importance to this study and that have been employed throughout. There are four main types of evidence that have been utilized across this work: newspapers and journals; institutional archives; individual records; and miscellaneous publications. The single most important source for the nineteenth-century historian of Anglo-Jewry, if it is possible to identify one, is the *Jewish Chronicle* newspaper. The oldest, most continually published Jewish newspaper in the world, and since its inception in the 1840s the most widely read in Britain, it is, as Cesarani has documented, 'almost impossible to understand the emergence of a modern Jewish identity in Britain without appreciating the paper's contribution'.¹⁰² Carrying verbatim reports on the proceedings of communal bodies, allowing impartial debates in its correspondence columns, interpreting the general and wider Jewish world to English Jews through its features, and employing editorials that acted as the 'community's monitor', the paper had a semi-official status as the communal mouthpiece.¹⁰³ Other

¹⁰² Cesarani, *Jewish Chronicle*, 248. Sadly, besides the paper itself, there are few remaining sources on the *Chronicle*, as its offices were destroyed during the London blitz.

¹⁰³ *Jewish Chronicle*, 25 Sept. 1863, 4.

Anglo-Jewish newspapers, operating at different times and catering to different levels, are used to supplement this coverage.¹⁰⁴ A variety of British journals, in particular that staple of propertied opinion *The Times*, are also employed to gain non-Jewish perspectives on events.

Anglo-Jewry is also well served in regard to institutional records, many central organizations having preserved considerable quantities of data.¹⁰⁵ The information contained within these holdings is often far from perfect but the researcher is able to quite accurately reconstruct the activities of a range of Anglo-Jewish organizations. Less plentiful are individual records: private memoirs, journals, and correspondence do not exist in great numbers. In comparison to their continental brethren British Jews were 'strikingly reticent about recording their experiences'.¹⁰⁶ Nevertheless, some material exists in sufficient quantity to make crucial contributions to the study of the minority. Correspondence collections such as those of Moses Montefiore, the Rothschilds, or Chief Rabbis Nathan and Hermann Adler are particularly useful, containing the private opinions of central actors over a long period upon a vast range of Jewish and British affairs. There is also considerable scope for obtaining information on Anglo-Jewry from the more numerous private collections of non-Jews who were involved with the community. The last category of sources, publications, is less useful to this book—Anglo-Jews were not prolific writers or critics—but contributes particularly to several areas. Any evaluation of British Jews' religion, for instance, needs to be cognizant of the many sermons that were published to edify and admonish the community.

After emancipation Anglo-Jewry was a remarkably integrated and acculturated minority within late nineteenth-century Britain. This

¹⁰⁴ The other less important Jewish journals researched are *Voice of Jacob*, published 1841–8, which was the first production of the Anglo-Jewish press and contains useful comment upon the state of the community during the emancipation campaign, and *Jewish World*, founded in 1873 and published into the twentieth century, which catered to a lower-status audience. Less impartial than the *Chronicle*, the *World* offered a distinctly partisan approach to Jewish issues and is therefore useful to the historian despite its smaller audience.

¹⁰⁵ L. Gartner, 'A Quarter Century of Anglo-Jewish Historiography', *JSS* 48/2 (Spring 1986), 105. Despite laudable communal efforts there has been some unavoidable loss: the 1941 destruction of the Mocatta Library, a victim of the blitz, saw, *inter alia*, the vast majority of sources upon the *Beth Din* destroyed, for instance.

¹⁰⁶ T. Endelman, 'The Frankaus of London: A Study in Radical Assimilation, 1837–1967', *Jewish History*, 8/1–2 (1994), 118.

book's three case studies all demonstrate that, upon varying levels and across a range of topics, cooperation and interaction between Jews, both individually and communally, and their surroundings—whether parliamentary, municipal, educational, or social—occurred easily and regularly. Upon many issues there appears a mutuality of ideas between English Jew and Gentile, an understanding that culminated in the complementary conception both held of their providentially inspired place within the world. This made Jews' minority existence comparatively easy and demonstrates the significant toleration and inclusiveness of British state and society, which was even receptive to assisting the perpetuation of certain levels of Jewish particularity. Anglo-Jews appreciated their beneficent situation and, sharing many of its ideals, acculturated easily. The largely voluntary Anglicization of Jewish identity in Britain is a major theme of this work.

However, this book also highlights the friction and dissonance apparent within Anglo-Jewry's dual identity and between the community and its host society. For all their potential consonance, the uptake of English attitudes and opinions frequently entailed loss and modification of traditional Jewish ones. This occasioned a significant decline in various aspects of the community's Jewishness, such as Diasporic connections, Hebrew culture, and religious commitment. Post-emancipation, there were, this study illustrates, numerous restrictions operating upon British Jews' self-expression. Also, it concludes that the success of Anglo-Jewish integration was distinctly limited. The community could not convince others (or itself) that it was just another nonconformist grouping, as pro-emancipationists had asserted, and Jews were still viewed in certain circumstances as foreign and otherwise not British. Anglo-Jewish identity was not correlative with any other contemporary formation. This created the potential for isolating clashes between 'mainstream' British and particular Jewish views, and would ensure the continuation of a level of anti-Jewish prejudice in the period.

Anglo-Jewry's emancipation had not solved the contradictions inherent to their dual definition. The community suffered from the ambivalence that characterized most other Jewries' modern existence. The ambiguity of Anglo-Jewish life is an essential theme within this analysis: in regard both to its more usually noticed negative aspects, as well as its less appreciated positive ramifications. It was this ambiguity, this work asserts, which was advantageously used by the community, exploiting the space available in Britain and keeping their position fluid, to pursue

an Anglo-Jewish existence that often satisfied many requirements of their combined identity, even if its lack of structure provided slender support in times of crisis. Exploring these elements this book outlines how and in what capacity a unique version of Jewish identity was formed in Britain during the post-emancipation era.

1

Establishment and Emancipation

The Formation of Anglo-Jewish Identity, 1656–1858

I

The Jewish experience in modern Britain began in 1656. Following the mass expulsion ordered by Edward I in 1290, this year witnessed the Resettlement or Readmission of Jews to England. Following a petition from the Dutch Rabbi Menassah Ben Israel, Oliver Cromwell sympathetically raised the possibility of a Jewish return at the Whitehall Conference of November 1655. The inconclusive decision of this meeting would determine the character of Jewish residence in Britain until emancipation. Whilst it balked at inviting Jewish settlement and did not recommend readmission, the Conference did concede that ‘there is no law that forbids the Jews’ return into England’.¹ This ambivalent response left Jews in a sort of legal limbo. No stricture was imposed upon possible Jewish immigration and the few Marranos already resident were not placed under any restrictions. A Jewish presence was thus tolerated *de facto*, as government turned a ‘blind eye’ to the question.² But without official sanction, the Jewish position, *de jure*, was highly insecure and frequently challenged. In 1660, 1664, and 1673 City merchants attempted to persecute the minority using legislation designed to suppress non-conforming religious services; Charles II intervened each time to protect the Jewish interest. Similarly, in 1685, James II ordered the release of thirty-seven Jews arrested for recusancy at the Royal Exchange.³

¹ D. Katz, *The Jews in the History of England 1485–1850* (Oxford, 1994), 144.

² *Ibid.* 241.

³ T. Endelman, *The Jews of Britain, 1656 to 2000* (London, 2002), 27–8.

The ambiguity of their position left a deep impression on the Jewish community. Whilst the lack of legal regulation allowed considerable freedom in comparison to many continental Jewries and facilitated communal self-determination, historians such as Harold Pollins and Geoffrey Alderman postulate that the Resettlement represented a 'negative freedom'.⁴ The minority could never be certain of its position and this imbued it with a deep insecurity, which forced Jews to live in a virtual ghetto, even though not compelled to do so.⁵ The community became preoccupied with appearing quiescent and inconspicuous.⁶ A tradition developed that the original settlers had unofficially contracted an agreement with Cromwell, a quid pro quo arrangement whereby Jews were permitted to return so long as they observed certain 'rules', such as making no converts and maintaining their own poor—generally, made no demands upon their hosts.⁷ As Charles II decreed in 1664, the continuation and justification of Jewish residence in England was not to be based upon any permanent legal solution but the conditional criteria of their good behaviour: 'so long as they demean themselves peaceably and quietly with due obedience to his Majesty's laws, and without scandal to his Government.'⁸

In these tenuous circumstances a Jewish community developed in Britain. From the estimated 160 Jews of the Resettlement, the community had increased to around 850 by the turn of the century, and reached approximately 8,000 by the mid eighteenth century.⁹ By the 1780s there were as many as 20,000–26,000 Jews in Britain. The community's formation was organizationally unique. Unlike its European counterparts it was not a *Kehilla*: there was no corporate dimension to the group, which

⁴ H. Pollins, *Economic History of the Jews in England* (London, 1982), 40.

⁵ G. Alderman, *Modern British Jewry*, 2nd edn. (Oxford, 1998), 33.

⁶ A. Barnett, 'Sussex Hall: The First Anglo-Jewish Venture in Popular Education', *TJHSE* 19 (1955–9), 65.

⁷ *JC*, 2 Mar. 1877, 4. No such compact has ever been discovered.

⁸ Quoted in Pollins, *Economic History*, 38.

⁹ *Ibid.* 242. It should be remembered that Jews were not a united minority at this time. The historic division between Sephardim and Ashkenazim was imported to England, where, at times, it generated substantial antagonisms between the two bodies, who developed separate institutional structures. By the second half of the century these distinctions had begun to lose force. Intermarriage, business ties, and acculturation were homogenizing the group, which began cooperating to supply general Jewish needs, such as kosher meat. More decisively, the relative position and prosperity of each group were levelling out, as from 1750 the Sephardic population remained relatively static. However, it was not until the nineteenth century that the two groups became intimate and began properly cooperating as a unified community. The Ashkenazim were invited to join the community's representative organ, the Board of Deputies, in 1805.

was ostensibly a voluntary collective. Power was diffuse: there were no 'court Jews' or *Landesrabbinat* to mediate between state and community, and no *Yeshivot* to religiously direct the minority.¹⁰ This meant there was a comparative absence of intra-communal guidance and restraint in Britain, which facilitated greater contact with the surrounding society. As a result, Anglo-Jewry acculturated to their environmental standards faster than other European Jews. English social habits and aspirations were increasingly adopted and utilization of the vernacular became pervasive. The minority suffered a concomitant decline in commitment to traditional Jewish customs. By the mid eighteenth century continental Jews were remarking with disappointment and scorn upon the poor learning and lax religiosity of the Jews in England.¹¹ The particular atmosphere of Britain encouraged this Jewish transformation. Undergoing a long-term transition to a modern, capitalist society, the polity (at least from the eighteenth century onwards) managed this within a stable political framework and with a remarkably open civil society.¹² Such a situation did not require Jews to theorize explanatory systems or create modernizing institutions to aid the relativization of their identities. As Todd Endelman has asserted, Anglo-Jewish acculturation proceeded smoothly, in a non-reflective and spontaneous manner.¹³

David Ruderman has questioned this version of Anglo-Jewish acculturation. Whilst appreciating that British patterns were indigenous, he attempts to demonstrate the existence of a *Haskalah*, an intellectual effort by Jews in Britain to accommodate their environment. But, echoing the earlier search of Cecil Roth, Ruderman locates only a handful of Jewish intellectuals, and the majority of these were foreign born and educated.¹⁴ This scarcity does much to undermine Ruderman's proposal; these cases were individuals, not a movement, and even he admits they obtained little moral or financial support from the community.¹⁵ Anglo-Jewish acculturation was not, then, a cognitive endeavour, as it often was for

¹⁰ Alderman, *Modern British Jewry*, 38.

¹¹ Katz, *The Jews*, 259.

¹² T. Endelman, *The Jews of Georgian England, 1714–1830: Tradition and Change in a Liberal Society* (Philadelphia, 1979), 34.

¹³ T. Endelman, 'The Englishness of Jewish Modernity in England', in J. Katz (ed.), *Toward Modernity: The European Jewish Model* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1987), 226–9.

¹⁴ See D. Ruderman, *Jewish Enlightenment in an English Key: Anglo-Jewry's Construction of Modern Jewish Thought* (Oxford, 2000), 89, 135, 184, 215, and C. Roth, 'The *Haskalah* in England', in I. Finestein, J. Rabinowitz, and H. Zimmels (eds.), *Essays Presented to Chief Rabbi Israel Brodie on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (London, 1967).

¹⁵ Ruderman, *Enlightenment*, 88.

European Jews, but more akin to a process of osmosis—the gradual and unconscious absorption of thoughts and actions.

The identity shift experienced by British Jews prior to the nineteenth century should not be over-exaggerated. It took many decades for Jews to stop regarding themselves as aliens and begin to conceive of themselves as Englishmen. More problematically, acculturation did not necessarily entail integration. As much as the Jew might adopt English habits, that he be included in society was reliant not just upon his actions but those of Gentiles. Socially, considerable integration was allowed, but Jews still remained on the margins of English society. For instance, whilst H. Henriques has found examples from 1677 of Jews being admitted as competent court witnesses, sworn according to their own usages despite this being illegal until 1838, he also notes that Parliament passed an Act in 1702 designed to promote conversion by obliging Jews to maintain their Protestant children.¹⁶ British Christians' opinions of the minority, while tolerant, were also often equivocal or negative. Jewish toleration in Britain was largely a consequence of existing religious pluralism. The prevalence of religious dissent in Britain made harsh persecution impractical, if not impossible, and promoted a necessary acceptance of confessional plurality.¹⁷ As Voltaire had wryly observed: 'S'il n'y avoit en Angleterre qu'une religion, le despotisme seroit à craindre: s'il n'y en avoit que deux, elles se couperoient la gorge, mais il y en a trente et elles vivent en paix et heureuses.'¹⁸ The result of this situation was that whilst Jews could achieve considerable acculturation, many Englishmen thought of them as different, as foreigners possessed, to use F. Felsenstein's term, of an 'exo-cultural otherness'.¹⁹

The extent of Gentile prejudice was startlingly revealed in 1753 over the matter of the 'Jew Bill', which provoked England's worst anti-Semitic incident of modern times. Passed by the Pelham Ministry in May 1753 with the intention of easing naturalization for wealthy Jewish immigrants, the Bill was repealed that November after an unprecedented agitation. Though mixed up, as T. Perry has shown, with the factionalism and low ethical standards of contemporary politics, the outcry soon became a full-scale debate upon the Jewish presence

¹⁶ H. Henriques, *The Jews and the English Law* (Oxford, 1908), 4, 183.

¹⁷ B. Van Oven, *Ought Baron de Rothschild to Sit in Parliament? An Imaginary Conversation between Judaeus and Amicus Nobilis* (London, 1847), 24.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, quoted on p. 24.

¹⁹ F. Felsenstein, *Antisemitic Stereotypes: A Paradigm of Otherness in English Popular Culture, 1660–1830* (London, 1995), 3.

in Britain.²⁰ Arguments initially motivated by political and economic interest soon aroused latent hostility and, with it, the airing of the full range of 'vile invective' medieval Christianity had concocted against Jewry.²¹ The actual ramifications of Jewish naturalization were largely ignored; the agitation was an exercise in identity formation, an assertion that the boundaries of eighteenth-century Englishness could not include Jews.²² Once this had been accomplished the agitation quickly subsided. British xenophobia had excluded an alien group from closer identification with society, after which it could return to practically tolerating them.

II

The 1830 introduction of a Jewish Relief Bill into Parliament inaugurated a new phase in Anglo-Jewish existence: the age of emancipation. In comparison to other Western Jewries, this experience came to British Jews late. The period 1780–1820 had seen French and Prussian Jews, among others, agitating successfully for increased rights, but the British community had been silent, even though other nonconformist groups were actively pursuing religious equality. The reason for such inertia was that Anglo-Jewry's situation was simply not that grievous.²³ As David Vital claims, 'by the end of the eighteenth century the Jews of England had little to complain of'.²⁴ Emancipation in England concerned the removal of a much less significant range of disabilities than it did on the Continent. Jews were not rootless aliens, they were merely discriminated against for not being members of the Established Church; a non-specific set of restrictions they shared with all non-Anglicans.²⁵

By the first decades of the nineteenth century, Jews' growing affinity with England had begun to stimulate a desire for equality of status. The protracted revolutionary and Napoleonic wars had stymied Jewish

²⁰ T. Perry, *Public Opinion, Propaganda, and Politics in Eighteenth-Century England: A Study of the Jew Bill of 1753* (Cambridge, Mass., 1962), 75, 177, and Endelman, *Jews of Britain*, 75.

²¹ M. Scult, *Millennial Expectations and Jewish Liberties: A Study of the Efforts to Convert the Jews in Britain up to the Mid-Nineteenth Century* (Leiden, 1978), 58.

²² Endelman, *Jews of Britain*, 76.

²³ Endelman, *Jews of Georgian England*, 176, 276.

²⁴ D. Vital, *A People Apart: A Political History of the Jews in Europe, 1789–1939* (Oxford, 1999), 39.

²⁵ Endelman, 'Englishness', 240.

immigration to Britain so that by 1841 approximately 90 per cent of the community were native born.²⁶ Despite its lack of practical consequences, emancipation had developed a symbolic importance to some of the Anglo-Jewish elite, who were concerned that discrimination impeded perceptions of them as natives. But it was only in conjunction with a perceived alteration in Jewry's status in 1830 that the need for equality was more widely accepted and a campaign for its achievement launched. The key to this was Parliament's emancipation of Protestant dissenters in 1828, then of Catholics in 1829, followed by the failure of a subsequent Jewish Relief Bill in 1830. Although its legal position remained unchanged, this represented a downgrading in the community's status. Anglo-Jews were now no longer part of a broad excluded group but a deliberately stigmatized community; the only politically disadvantaged minority in Britain. This situation was psychologically burdensome; as the Bishop of Dublin informed the Lords in 1833 it entailed a 'positive injury' to the group.²⁷ Francis Goldsmid considered its effects more expressively in a pamphlet:

whither shall the Jew look for consolation? Among one thousand of his countrymen he will see that he alone is marked by the badge of dishonour; that all others are free to follow those paths of creditable ambition, which against him alone are closed. . . all these causes combine to inspire every individual exposed to their action, with a depressing sense of degradation, which he would in vain try to shake off—and to cow the spirit of the whole community.²⁸

This special condition spurred a desire for equality: emancipation had become necessary to relieve burdens to Anglo-Jewry's identity.

The possibility of becoming equal Englishmen confronted Anglo-Jewry with the existential dilemma that beset all European Jewish communities in the period of emancipation: how to reconcile being Jewish in the modern world. Having previously adapted gradually to modernity the sudden question of emancipation abruptly forced British Jews to consider aspects of their existence they had been content to let drift. Bereft of any coordinating system of explanation, this fractured communal opinion, revealing a spectrum of Jewish identities

²⁶ Alderman, *Modern British Jewry*, 7.

²⁷ Quoted in D. Salomons, *A Short Statement on Behalf of His Majesty's Subjects Professing the Jewish Religion* (London, 1835), 7, and Endelman, *Jews of Georgian England*, 281.

²⁸ F. Goldsmid, *Remarks on the Civil Disabilities of British Jews* (London, 1830), 21 and 35.

and related future models upon which a Jew's position would determine how emancipation affected him or her. Two distinct poles buttressed this scope: the ultra-Orthodox rejection and the highly Anglicized acceptance. The former, a very small minority, religiously believed that Jews were meant to be outcasts; a separate race, prevented from becoming natives by divine injunction. This cause was championed by Joseph Crooll, a tutor in Hebrew at Cambridge, who collaborated with Gentile opponents of equality to demonstrate the alien character of Jews.²⁹ Emancipation had little impact upon such Jews, who did not recognize the validity of its questions.

At the opposite end of the scale was a small, self-selected section of the Jewish elite who were to become the main protagonists of emancipation. These Jews, men such as Isaac Lyon Goldsmid, his son Francis Henry, Joshua van Oven, and David Salomons, had already undergone a 'reorientation in Jewish consciousness'; Anglicized in both mentality and lifestyle, they believed it possible to simultaneously combine life as Jew and Englishman.³⁰ This contention was based, however, on downgrading Jewishness from an all-encompassing mode of existence to being merely a religious creed, the faith aspect of an individual's identity. They were Englishmen of the Jewish faith. Jewish ethnic and national connotations were forsaken; a point Jewish pamphleteers were keen to emphasize: 'I must protest at once against the employment of the term *nation*. There is no such thing as the Jewish nation. It is long since the Jews have ceased to be a nation,' appealed Bernard van Oven in 1847.³¹ Their nationality was henceforth to be located solely within Britishness. A Mr Keyzor explained this sentiment colloquially to the inhabitants of Southwark at an emancipation meeting: 'he did feel aggrieved to find himself treated like a foreigner and alien. He was ready

²⁹ A. Gilam, *The Emancipation of the Jews in England, 1830–1860* (London, 1982), 40.

³⁰ Endelman, *Jews of Georgian England*, 273.

³¹ Van Oven, *Ought Baron de Rothschild to Sit in Parliament?*, 7. Italics in original. Such sentiment meant that Jews occasionally took issue with Disraeli for his 'eccentric fictions' regarding the Jewish race: 'To Mr. D'Israeli [*sic*] we shall be under no obligation whenever Baron Rothschild or any other Jew shall sit in Parliament. We did not like his silent votes, nor do we admire his advocacy of our claims, "as descendants of a race acknowledged to be sacred, and the professors of a religion admitted to be divine". We demand that "full and complete justice shall speedily be done to us"—as Mr. D'Israeli hopes it will be—not as a peculiar race, or on account of a peculiar religion, but as citizens of the same state,' opined the *JC*, 9 Aug. 1850, 346.

to go to the shores of the British nation, and attack any Frenchman that might attempt to land.³²

Situated in between these two antithetical extremes was a broad and undefined middle section encapsulating the mass of Anglo-Jewry. This amorphous grouping contained various positions on emancipation but all were imbued with a level of uncertainty and ambivalence regarding their future as Englishmen and Jews. This scepticism was championed by two stalwarts of the communal establishment: Moses Montefiore, President of the Board of Deputies, and Chief Rabbi Solomon Herschell and, from 1845, Nathan Adler. Committed to more traditional conceptions of Jewish existence, these men were determined not to submerge aspects of Jewishness beneath the freedom of English universalism.³³ They both, therefore, played a reticent role in the campaign. Montefiore, particularly in the 1830s, did some work supporting appeals, but his efforts were not prodigious and his approach was fundamentally constructed upon the oft-quoted commitment he recorded in his diary of 1837: 'I am most firmly resolved not to give up the smallest part of our religious forms and privileges to obtain civil rights.'³⁴ Adler's contribution was so anonymous that he was forced in March 1858 to write to *The Times* denying that he thought equality would subvert Jewish law and was therefore opposed to the measure.³⁵

This reaction was not, however, an ultra-Orthodox rejection of any acculturation. Most of these Jews considered themselves Englishmen and were convinced of the virtues of British culture. The Adler Rabbinate would witness considerable Anglicization of Jewish religious forms; Montefiore was an exemplary Victorian gentleman: public-spirited, well regarded, he also held a baronetcy. Neither was opposed to emancipation and trusted it would be achieved. For this middle section of Jewry the question of their reaction to modernity was still open and the impact of emancipation created confusion over their self-definition. A possible dichotomy arose between the two facets of their identity: Englishness and Jewishness. These leaders wished to continue as before, gradually

³² *The Times*, 15 Jan. 1848, 3.

³³ I. Finstein, 'The Jews and the English Marriage Law during the Emancipation', in idem, *Jewish Society in Victorian England* (London, 1993), 70.

³⁴ L. Loewe (ed.), *Diaries of Sir Moses and Lady Montefiore*, 2 vols. (London, 1890), i. 111.

³⁵ *The Times*, 24 Mar. 1858, 9.

melding the two together as and when they could, rather than be forced to prioritize. This engendered what Michael Salbstein refers to as a 'passive conception of emancipation'.³⁶ Unfortunately, this position provided no solution to the existential issues raised by emancipation and the elite were continually pulled between contradictory poles and pushed to decide the balance of elements within Anglo-Jewish definition. The modern nation state, treating all its citizens as equal individuals, could not tolerate special groups operating under peculiar conditions, and as the Jews' integration increased so the community's particular interests clashed with their universal environment.

In 1850, for instance, the minority sought exemption from the provisions of the Metropolitan Internment Bill, which would have violated Jewish burial rites.³⁷ A more telling incidence was provided by the 1857 Matrimonial Clauses Act. This, *inter alia*, ended religious authority in matters of divorce, granting civil courts the power to dissolve clerically sanctioned marriages. Adler and Montefiore, attempting to preserve Jewish religious control, successfully lobbied for the inclusion of a clause exempting Jewish marriage. Despite Gentile acquiescence, at the third reading of the Bill in the Lords the clause was struck out. This was a direct result of counter-lobbying by Salomons and Lionel de Rothschild, who feared perpetuating a special situation for Jews and, thereby, damaging their case for inclusion. 'As Englishmen, when they were seeking their rights as such from the country, they ought to submit to the general laws, like the professors of every other religion.'³⁸ The *Jewish Chronicle (JC)* was shocked, predicting a 'collision between the law of God and the law of man'.³⁹ But such an outcome was typical; in this period conflicts were inevitably decided to the detriment of religious particularity. Modernity required concessions at tradition's expense, as emancipationist Jews realized.⁴⁰ Adaptation rather than separation had always held sway in Britain.

³⁶ M. Salbstein, *The Emancipation of the Jews in Britain: The Question of the Admission of the Jews to Parliament, 1828–1860* (London, 1982), 86.

³⁷ A. Gilam, 'The Burial Grounds Controversy between Anglo-Jewry and the Victorian Board of Health, 1850', *JSS* 45/2 (Spring 1983), 149, 151, 155. The Bill made burials a public service, closing private cemeteries. All interments were in future to take place in national cemeteries under the authority of the Board of Health. Widely resisted by all religions in Britain, the Act was never effectively enforced and was repealed within two years.

³⁸ *JC*, 3 July 1857, 1063. The statement was made by Mr Magnus at a Deputies meeting voting upon whether to lobby for an exemption clause in the Act.

³⁹ *Ibid.* 1060.

⁴⁰ Gilam, 'Burial Grounds Controversy', 147.

The lack of unanimity regarding emancipation's desirability produced a corresponding multiplicity of strategies concerning its attainment. The most eager Jews adopted a doctrinaire approach, demanding immediate equality as Englishmen on the principle that religious conscience was a private concern. This argument removed the particularity of the Jewish case, enabling them to associate with other confessions and broader causes to petition for the same rights. Jews became *soi-disant* nonconformists: 'We desire to be placed on an equality in point of civil privileges, with other persons dissenting from the Established Church,' began one of Isaac Goldsmid's pleas for relief.⁴¹ Since other minorities had been granted equality under the liberal principles governing British politics, it was inconsistent and irrational to deny it to Jews, ran the logic. This approach had suffered an early blow in 1830 with the rejection of the first relief proposal, and with continuous resistance from the Lords, it became increasingly obvious by the later 1830s that a doctrinaire appeal was not going to achieve its goal.

The other main Jewish strategy—a pragmatic, step-by-step acceptance of rights as they were offered—was both more realistic and successful, being more in tune with the habits of the legislature, which was wary of dry principle but receptive to practical advance. For the middle section of Jewry this approach had the advantage of ensuring their demands did not outstrip the pace of Gentile acceptance whilst also allowing them to keep a closer watch over their traditions. Those Jews, like Montefiore, prepared to wait for their equality thought 'that they should take what they could get', when they had an opportunity to get it.⁴² A more active interpretation of this approach was pursued by David Salomons, whose idea was to progressively obtain honours barred to Jews, fulfil them, and thereby force the removal of what had become a practical grievance rather than a theoretical hardship. To this end he was elected sheriff of London in 1835, alderman in 1844, MP in 1851, and mayor of London in 1856. At each stage Salomons and liberal Gentiles were able to challenge the logic and legality of Jewish exclusion, accumulating increasing proof of Jewish ability to bring to bear the next time.⁴³ To fair-minded Englishmen this approach was persuasive, and Salomons is credited with eliciting bills from Parliament

⁴¹ *JC*, 7 Mar. 1845, 109.

⁴² Loewe (ed.), *Diaries*, i. 79.

⁴³ D. Salomons, *The Case of David Salomons, Esq., Being his Address to the Court of Alderman on Applying for Admission as Alderman of the Ward of Portsoken* (London, 1844), 24.

in 1835 allowing Jews to attain the freedom of the City and in 1845 opening municipal offices to them. In this vein the 1847 election of Rothschild made the ultimate outcome of the emancipation campaign merely a matter of time.

The danger of this gradualist tactic was that for the unconvinced it could easily lapse into apathy. Patient waiting did not appear that different from lack of interest. Indeed, accusations of indifference had dogged the campaign from the beginning. *The Times*, discussing the possibility of Jewish equality following that of dissenters and Catholics in 1829, believed

it was a surprise to some that the professors of the Mosaic law did not stir to claim a share in the general freedom, or even to obtain the common privileges of natural-born subjects. . . . But perhaps this very indifference is the best evidence that they do not feel their exclusion; and offers the best apology for our delay in removing it.⁴⁴

This latter sentiment was 'industriously urged' by Gentile opponents throughout the campaign.⁴⁵ Jewish emancipationists were keen to refute it and there were attempts to demonstrate popular Jewish support through the organization of societies, such as the Jewish Association for the Removal of Civil and Religious Disabilities, formed in 1847.⁴⁶ Most historians agree, though, that the majority of the Anglo-Jewish community, including its upper classes, was unmoved by the cause of political equality.⁴⁷ The privileges on offer could only be enjoyed by a few, and most Jews were far more concerned with earning a livelihood or pursuing financial success, to which the law provided no barriers. Interest mounted after Rothschild's election, and his eventual entry into the Commons elicited communal celebration, but for much of the time most Jews were not engaged with the cause.⁴⁸ In the 1850s a professional Hebrew gentleman famously informed Henry Mayhew that 'he doubted whether one [Jewish] man in ten would trouble himself to walk the length of the street in which

⁴⁴ *The Times*, 28 Aug. 1829, 2.

⁴⁵ *Two Letters, in Answer to the Objections Urged against Mr. Grant's Bill for the Relief of the Jews* (London, 1830), 11.

⁴⁶ D. Cesarani, *The Jewish Chronicle and Anglo-Jewry, 1841–1991* (Cambridge, 1994), 15. Joseph Mitchell, the then proprietor of the *JC*, was the leading force behind the Association's creation.

⁴⁷ Katz, *The Jews*, 323.

⁴⁸ Alderman, *Modern British Jewry*, 52, 63.

he lived to secure Baron Rothschild's admission into the House of Commons'.⁴⁹ Amongst themselves Jewish emancipationists admitted the low-level of general commitment and frequently reproached their brethren for it.⁵⁰

The emancipation campaign was a long-drawn out affair. Beneath all the rhetoric and fuss, Anglo-Jews had to live their lives as their future definition was debated around them. Communal life generally continued along the path that had led it to the nineteenth century; gentle acculturation continued and integration slowly increased. Use of the vernacular became ever more widespread, penetrating particularly into the religious sphere. Attempts were also made by certain synagogues to improve the forms of their services: efforts that were systematized by Adler in 1847, when he issued a code of regulations to all British synagogues that incorporated many acculturated religious concepts.⁵¹ Other areas where notable progress was made by the minority include poverty reduction—with the three City congregations agreeing in 1835 to collaborate over poor relief—and educational provision (enhanced by the 1812 establishment of the Jews' Free School and its expansion in 1820, 1848, and 1855).⁵² There were significant differences, however, in the nature of these developments compared to the previous communal pattern. Crucially, they were far less spontaneously achieved. From the beginning of the nineteenth century the community, unable to ignore the surrounding dialogue upon its existence, began contemplating its condition. A general belief prevailed that the minority required improvement. Inside the community, acculturated Jews sharing English social aspirations were often dissatisfied with the socio-cultural standard

⁴⁹ Quoted in U. Henriques, 'The Jewish Emancipation Controversy in Nineteenth-Century Britain', *Past and Present*, 40 (July 1968), 128.

⁵⁰ *VJ*, 21 July 1848, 129. It was only in the last few years of the campaign, and notably after Rothschild's fourth return for the City in 1857, that enthusiasm for emancipation spread widely throughout the community; although in the provinces, where communal affairs were more open, the campaign for emancipation was more widely popular from an earlier stage. See Endelman, *Jews of Britain*, 107–8.

⁵¹ D. Feldman, *Englishmen and Jews: Social Politics and Political Culture, 1840–1914* (London, 1994), 53. The code included many stipulations designed to increase decorum and piety in the service, such as: exclusion of children under 4, limit on recitation of monetary offerings, and loud responses being forbidden.

⁵² J. Picciotto, *Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History* (London, 1975), 293; S. Levin, 'Origins of the Jews' Free School', *TJHSE* 19 (1955–9), 97; University of Southampton Library, MS 153, Photocopy of Report of the Jews' Free School, May 1860, 8, 10.

of their brethren—experiencing a sense of inferiority, they looked to raise standards.⁵³

But the main force motivating these attempts at self-development came from outside: the context of the emancipation debate. One of the most frequently expressed arguments in opposition to Jewish relief was that the minority lacked civilized values and could not equally participate in the majority culture.⁵⁴ Even Gentile proponents of emancipation tacitly admitted this and regularly advised Jews to advance their case by first proving their capabilities. The pragmatic strategy toward emancipation was implicitly founded upon this idea of Jewish improvement—accepting piecemeal gains in order that Jews might at each stage demonstrate their worthiness for advancement to the next level. This never became the keystone of the process, as it was in Germany, for instance. But a perceived connection between improvement and emancipation was pervasive in the British context.⁵⁵

It stimulated action by the communal leadership to cultivate their co-religionists, the most overt of which was the establishment of the Jews' Literary and Scientific Institution, popularly called Sussex Hall after its location, in 1844. Modelled on Birkbeck's Mechanics' Institutes, it was designed 'for the intellectual and moral improvement of the Jewish people'.⁵⁶ A free library was available, regular lectures were delivered, and the Institution was non-denominational to facilitate social intercourse with Gentiles. Little of the programme was, though, dedicated to Jewish culture; by 1848 not one of the planned lectures had a Jewish title.⁵⁷ The elite's intention was not simply to promote knowledge but to demonstrate that Jews could participate in general culture; as Joseph Mitchell, proprietor of the *JC*, stated at a celebration of Rothschild's first election: 'by the establishment of that institution, the reproach that the Jews spent all their energies in obtaining wealth, and devoted no portion of their time to literature, had been removed. Sussex Hall would refute charges of that nature.'⁵⁸ Considering this functional approach to the Institution by the communal elite, it seems no coincidence that Sussex Hall closed due to lack of funds

⁵³ I. Finestein, 'Anglo-Jewish Opinion during the Struggle for Emancipation (1828–1858)', in *idem*, *Jewish Society*, 16.

⁵⁴ Cesarani, *Jewish Chronicle*, 22. ⁵⁵ *Ibid.* 22.

⁵⁶ Barnett, 'Sussex Hall', 67.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.* 73.

⁵⁸ *VJ*, 24 Sept. 1847, 3.

in 1858, just after the achievement of emancipation and with its job therefore done.⁵⁹

III

There was another aspect to communal developments in the emancipation era. On the Continent most Jews were bound into statutorily regulated communities, where membership was compulsory and legal powers existed to enforce cohesion. In Britain the group operated within an associational framework with no powers of coercion beyond social exclusion. To this unregulated situation emancipation presented several problems. How was the community to be governed when equality placed the relationship between Jews and the state on a completely individual basis? The community had relied upon the external constraints of legal disabilities and Gentile prejudice, augmented by minority endogamy and strict synagogue codes, to maintain and justify communal authority, but emancipation threatened to override all of these.⁶⁰ Exacerbating this difficulty was the state of flux Anglo-Jewish identification was experiencing. Just as emancipation stimulated self-referential questions (who am I?), so it had a similar impact upon the collective consciousness of the minority: what are we? The ambiguity concerning the boundaries between Jewishness and Englishness thus permeated the institutional level, as the Jewish leadership pondered how to guide the community into the modern age. To overcome these interrelated challenges the Jewish leadership constructed and consolidated various communal institutions during the emancipation campaign.

Fearful of the weakening of group cohesion historically occasioned by greater integration, it was primarily those Jews more ambivalent towards equality's blessings who sought to solve the problem of governing Jewry in the modern age. The twin pillars of this effort, representing the religious and lay powers, were to be the Chief Rabbinate and the Board of Deputies. Both of these institutions coalesced into their modern forms in response to emancipation. Adler used his position as the first elected

⁵⁹ Barnett, 'Sussex Hall', 77.

⁶⁰ T. Endelman, *Radical Assimilation in English Jewish History, 1656–1945* (Bloomington, Ind., 1990), 7.

and, hence, legitimate Chief Rabbi to centralize religious power. With his 1847 Laws and Regulations he obtained near dictatorial control: only he could possess the title of rabbi and all synagogue officials were approved by him.⁶¹ The Board of Deputies attempted to establish similar autocracy in Jewish public affairs. Under the presidency of Montefiore this was transformed in 1836 from an ad hoc and rather aimless body into an officially recognized council with statutory powers. With these power centres Adler and Montefiore, frequently collaborating, hoped to prevent the emergence of heterodox opinions and limit the loss of tradition as they steered the community into the modern era.

Unfortunately, these institutions offered no solution to emancipation's questions. Like the figures that headed them, they embodied the ambivalence of Jew and Englishman. Such a traditional attempt to organize the community was out of step with modern English society. The 'deferential foundation' of these institutions and their oligarchic, patrician ethos contrasted with Britain's increasing democratization and was perpetually criticized by those, such as provincial congregations or professional men, who were excluded.⁶² Perhaps more serious was the denial of pluralism inherent to these methods of governance. Claiming to espouse the only viewpoint of the minority, as if it were homogeneous, was an anachronistic idea, contradicting the logic of emancipation. Having fractured Jewish identity in the spirit of equality, emancipation had also invalidated any claims to an exclusive Jewish communal character. Attempting to impose one led, inevitably, to conflict and the eventual realization of the identity split at a communal level.

The most serious breach in nineteenth-century Jewish communal relations began on 15 April 1840, when twenty-four Jews declared their intention to establish 'a synagogue in the western part of the metropolis, where a revised service may be performed at hours more suited to our habits, and in a manner more calculated to inspire feelings of devotion'.⁶³ With this act Reform Judaism was established

⁶¹ L. Gartner, 'Emancipation, Social Change and Communal Reconstruction in Anglo-Jewry, 1789–1881', *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, 54 (1987), 96.

⁶² I. Finestein, 'The Anglo-Jewish Revolt of 1853', in idem, *Jewish Society*, 114, and T. Endelman, 'Communal Solidarity among the Jewish Elite of Victorian London', *Victorian Studies*, 28/3 (1985), 497.

⁶³ Quoted in A. Kershen and J. Romain, *Tradition and Change: A History of Reform Judaism in Britain, 1840–1995* (London, 1995), 3. Uniquely in the European context Reform Judaism in Britain emerged, in the main, from the Sephardic rather than Ashkenazic community.

in Britain. The main concern of this movement was to acclimatize Judaism. The most Anglicized of Jews, they sought a form of faith more compatible with their upper and middle-class British perceptions. There was little ideological underpinning to these alterations. The more theologically minded within the movement exhibited certain neo-Karaite beliefs—bibliocentricity and downplaying the significance of the Talmud—but these were more ‘shapeless tendencies’ than a ‘crystallised doctrine’.⁶⁴ Some historians have speculated that the motivation for the breakaway was, however, inspired by the German model. David Philipson and Michael Meyer have viewed the movement as an echo of German Reform, highlighting points of contact between leading figures on both sides.⁶⁵ Most historians, though, dismiss causative links with Germany. Religiously, the two were very different. The radicalism of German Reform was condemned across the Anglo-Jewish community, which feared it would lead to dissolution.⁶⁶ Reform in Britain was much more conservative. Modifications were mainly limited to the manner rather than the content of worship: use of English increased; a premium was placed on decorous worship; and prayers ‘not strictly of a devotional character’ were abridged.⁶⁷ No crucial beliefs were tampered with; most significantly, nothing of a nationalist nature was removed.⁶⁸ British Reform was not a major overhaul of the faith but a readjustment.

It was also bound up with domestic communal issues. There was a demographic aspect to the foundation of a separate synagogue. Since the turn of the century there had been growing pressure from the increasing number of wealthy Jews migrating to the West End for the establishment of a local synagogue to make their attendance less strenuous.⁶⁹ Connected to this was a desire amongst the rebels to have more influence in communal authority. The revolt was not only

⁶⁴ Endelman, ‘Englishness’, 236. The Karaites are a Jewish sect that arose in the eighth century: rejecting the oral law, they believe in a literal approach to the Scriptures.

⁶⁵ For a summary of these and other positions see D. Langton, *Claude Montefiore: His Life and Thought* (London, 2002), 176–9.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.* 177.

⁶⁷ MS 140/1 Copy of Letter to the Elders of the Spanish and Portuguese Synagogue, Aug. 1841.

⁶⁸ Endelman, ‘Englishness’, 233. The case was slightly different for the smaller Reform congregations established in Manchester (1858) and Bradford (1873). A large proportion of their congregants were German Jewish immigrants and, accordingly, continental influences were significantly more prominent. These synagogues were still under the nominal patronage of West London, however, and followed the British movement’s liturgy.

⁶⁹ Langton, *Claude Montefiore*, 178.

ecclesiastical but temporal. The West London Synagogue of British Jews, consecrated on 27 January 1842, provided politically active Jews with a forum through which to challenge the monopoly of communal authority and push their agenda of full equality.⁷⁰ With its various motivations the Reform development in Britain can fundamentally be seen as a response to modernity, an attempt to reconcile the dichotomy presented by emancipation. These Jews had chosen the balance of their identity. Judaism was to be confined to the religious sphere; nationally and culturally—as stressed by their synagogue’s title that abolished the old distinctions between Jewish types—they were British.

This was exactly the reaction to emancipation the middle section of Anglo-Jewry feared. Reducing the faith, as they perceived it, to embrace Englishness was anathema to them. The *Mahamad* of Bevis Marks declared it ‘an infraction of the religious compact binding the whole of the Jewish nation’.⁷¹ The Orthodox authorities reacted with due harshness, proclaiming a *herem* against the new congregation. This placed the Reformers outside the pale of Judaism, prohibiting contact between them and Orthodox Jews. Montefiore excluded them from representation on the Deputies, as well as refusing to provide their synagogue with a marriage licence.⁷² After issuing a warning against association with Reformers, Bevis Marks purged itself of members involved with the movement.⁷³ The community was generally more sympathetic. After denouncing the initial split, the Anglo-Jewish press became more understanding of Reform and called for rapprochement whilst advocating some of their modifications.⁷⁴ The Western Synagogue refused to acknowledge the ban, as did several provincial congregations.⁷⁵ Even at Bevis Marks there was regret, which led in 1849 to the lifting of the caution upon Reformers, though their congregation remained barred from communal participation.⁷⁶

⁷⁰ Feldman, *Englishmen*, 50.

⁷¹ Spanish and Portuguese Jews’ Congregation, MS 113, Minutes of the Meetings of the *Mahamad*, 1833–44, p. x.

⁷² University of Southampton Library, MS 259, Copies of Papers of Sir Moses Montefiore, 1793–1885, Letter from Montefiore to Goldsmid, 9 Feb. 1842.

⁷³ Spanish and Portuguese Jews’ Congregation, MS 113, Minutes of the Meetings of the *Mahamad*, 1833–44, p. x.

⁷⁴ Cesarani, *Jewish Chronicle*, 12, 17.

⁷⁵ A. Barnett, *The Western Synagogue through Two Centuries (1791–1961)* (London, 1961), 181.

⁷⁶ Picciotto, *Sketches*, 382.

The very existence of Reform threw into sharp relief the issue of whether a Jewish community existing on a voluntary basis could maintain an effective structure.⁷⁷ To protect their position the authorities were determined to isolate and limit Reform, hoping to extinguish a movement that demonstrably ended the nominal homogeneity of Jewry in Britain. No compromise was possible. In 1853, for instance, four Reformers were elected as Deputies for Orthodox provincial synagogues, sparking a debate at the Board as to whether they might be allowed to sit. The discussion was highly controversial and arguments got so heated upon one occasion that the police were summoned. Montefiore, as President, eventually cast his vote over the evenly divided Deputies to exclude the Reformers.⁷⁸ The ramifications of such exclusion extended beyond the community. During the emancipation campaign Anglo-Jewry was under observation. Prohibiting internal dissent and establishing religious tests for communal participation appeared hypocritical, as Jews requested an end to such prejudice in wider society. 'Such conduct on our part places weapons in the hands of our antagonists . . . Whilst we also consider it unwise or dangerous to admit into our legislature any dissenters, how can we demand a greater concession on the part of the Christians?' pondered an 1845 pamphleteer.⁷⁹ This lack of cooperation was damaging to the emancipation campaign not only in principle but also in practice. The separate and conflicting deputations made by Montefiore, as President of the Deputies, and Isaac Goldsmid, on behalf of West London, to Sir Robert Peel in 1845 concerning the possibility of municipal relief for Jews are an oft-cited example of how division retarded emancipation.⁸⁰ Adopting different stances and requesting different outcomes, these representations exposed the lack of unanimity within Anglo-Jewry and allowed Gentiles to dictate the pace.

⁷⁷ Feldman, *Englishmen*, 66.

⁷⁸ Finestein, 'Anglo-Jewish Revolt', 121–4. The inclusion of the Reform Deputies was tied up with a wider progressive agenda that some congregations wished to implement at the Board. Alongside admission of West London, other major issues included greater weighting for provincial representation and increasing democratization to open the Deputies' ranks to professional and middle-class men. After the vote, many favouring change withdrew from the Board: Salomons resigned; the Great Synagogue reduced its representation; and provincial participation slumped.

⁷⁹ Anonymous, *Jewish Emancipation by an Israelite* (London, 1845), 6.

⁸⁰ British Library, Peel Papers, see MS 40,540, fos. 126, 128, Letters from Goldsmid to Peel, 18 Feb. 1845 and 7 Mar. 1845; and MS 40,567, fo. 249, Letter from Montefiore to Peel, 20 May 1845.

IV

Emancipation was a dialogue. It was not just the approximately 35,000 British Jews whose identity would be changed by the outcome of the campaign. The nature of the British state would also be altered and, consequently, notable interest was evinced towards the subject by Gentiles. The attitudes of Christians toward the minority in their midst had a profound impact upon the self-perception of Anglo-Jewry. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, considerable anti-Jewish prejudice still existed in Britain. Objections to the possibility of equality were numerous and multiform: based on religious grounds, national grounds, and grounds of moral character, which often bridged the other two.⁸¹ Jewish emancipationists recognized this but expected a quick improvement.⁸² Over the next few decades this gradually occurred, as many anti-Jewish caricatures diminished in potency and frequency. By 1849 the *JC* felt sanguine enough to proclaim: 'At no epoch in the Christian era were the relations between the confessors of the ancient faith of Judaism and those who profess the modern one of Christianity, more amicable than at present.'⁸³

The community was the more surprised, then, that for some people prejudice was too ingrained to be reformed, particularly as this group seemed to include a large number of peers whose intractable opposition restricted Jews' station for many years. The most persistently held argument against Jewish emancipation was that it would end the shared Christianity that provided one of the few bonds within the British political community.⁸⁴ Sir Robert Inglis, Tory MP for the University of Oxford, explained to the Commons in 1850:

Our legislature has never assembled except under Christian sanctions. We had sacrificed much . . . when within these 21 years persons not previously admissible were admitted to the legislature; but the case then was different; they all looked to the same common saviour . . . The profession of a common Christianity was the birthright of this nation, and it should not be lightly

⁸¹ U. Henriques, 'The Jewish Emancipation Controversy in Nineteenth-Century Britain', *Past and Present*, 40 (July 1968), 131.

⁸² UCL Special Collections, Mocatta MSS 22 (1), Goldsmid Letterbooks, i, Letter from Joshua van Oven to Goldsmid, 9 Apr. 1829.

⁸³ *JC*, 4 May 1849, 237.

⁸⁴ Feldman, *Englishmen*, 34.

sold for any such advantage as Baron de Rothschild might furnish to their deliberations.⁸⁵

This belief in the interrelation of Christianity, the nation, and political authority delayed emancipation in Britain; for as David Feldman shows the conviction could not be altered by Jewish improvement.⁸⁶ Their non-profession of Christianity automatically disqualified Jews from full citizenship.⁸⁷ To these people the Jew was simply outside the parameters of English identity. Lord Derby, as late as July 1857, warned the Lords that ‘an impassable gulf’ separated Jew and Englishmen: ‘what the Jews were in Egypt, they are in England . . . though among us they are not of us.’⁸⁸

Standing in contradiction to this Gentile opposition was a notable level of support for Jewish claims. It was derived from a variety of opinions and principles. The argument that the Jew had a right to participate equally in the society of which he bore an equal burden, irrespective of his religion, was a staple of the pro-emancipationists. Gladstone’s conversion to the measure was partly justified by this sentiment and for Lord Russell it was the only issue: ‘I place the question on this simple, but, I think, solid ground—that every Englishman is entitled to the honours and advantages that the British Constitution gives. I state further, that religious opinion, of itself, ought to be no disqualification for the enjoyment of those rights.’⁸⁹ As the campaign rumbled on and the Lords continually blocked a measure favoured by the Commons, and thereby continually denied, after 1847, the electors of London the ability to select their own representative, further political principles became involved, adding weight to the Jews’ cause.⁹⁰

⁸⁵ Rothschild Archive, London, 000/924/4, Volume of Press Cuttings entitled ‘Baron Rothschild and the House of Commons—Debate etc. 1850’.

⁸⁶ Feldman, *Englishmen*, 36.

⁸⁷ Gilam, *Emancipation*, 25.

⁸⁸ Quoted in I. Finestein, ‘A Modern Examination of Macaulay’s Case for the Civil Emancipation of the Jews’, in idem, *Jewish Society*, 91, and Finestein, ‘Anglo-Jewish Opinion’, 8.

⁸⁹ Rothschild Archive, London, 000/573/6, Sundry MSS and Pamphlets: W. Gladstone, *Substance of a Speech on the Motion of Lord John Russell for a Committee of the Whole House with a View to the Removal of the Remaining Jewish Disabilities; Delivered in the House of Commons, on Thursday, December 16, 1847* (London, 1848), 4, and J. Russell, *Jewish Disabilities: A Speech Delivered in the House of Commons, December 16, 1847, on the Jewish Disabilities* (London, 1848), 7.

⁹⁰ See *The Times*, 1 Feb. 1848, 3, and 17 July 1851, 4.

The cause also had its Gentile religious supporters. Whilst opponents invoked Christian identity to deny Jews' equality, others looked to a shared religious heritage and emphasized the Judaic basis of Christianity to support their inclusion.⁹¹ This kind of religious support was not an unalloyed blessing for the community. British philosemitism was based on the hope and expectation that Jews would eventually convert, and, hence, cease to exist as Jews. Religious support for emancipation was no different; many thought that greater integration would speed conversion: 'Why are we to perpetuate the errors of the Jews, by keeping them at a distance from the mild and holy precept of Christianity? As the most simple mode of decomposing error is by bringing it into contact with truth, so the most certain mode of perpetuating it, is by intolerance and violence. . . the High Priest of the synagogue has more to fear than the Archbishop of Canterbury.'⁹² Besides this, many religious supporters continued to hold negative conceptions of Jews and Judaism; belief in their decidual guilt, divinely ordained exile, and lower standard of religious morality remained commonplace.⁹³

Ambiguity regarding the actual subjective existence of the Jew in Britain, separated from whatever objective principle demanded his emancipation, was not limited to the faithful. It was a constant for most Gentile pro-emancipationists. There was a widespread presupposition that centuries of oppression had degenerated Jewry. Thomas Babington Macaulay, whose speeches in favour of emancipation became 'the main statement of the case', displayed an inherent belief in Jewish exclusivity and need for improvement.⁹⁴ His advocacy of Jewish rights frequently utilized negative images to demonstrate the inefficacy of opposition:

⁹¹ Phoenix, *Scriptural Reasonings in Support of the Jewish Claims to Sit in the Commons House of Parliament Addressed to the Conscience of the Christian People of the British Empire* (London, 1850), 3. Another common theme running through many of these religiously argued pamphlets was the idea that British Christians owed the Jews a debt in light of past mistreatment. Emancipation, it was reasoned, might go some way towards redeeming this abuse.

⁹² B. Montagu, *A Letter to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Chichester upon the Emancipation of the Jews* (London, 1834), 16, 19.

⁹³ See, for instance, A Country Vicar, *Jewish Emancipation: A Christian Duty* (London, 1853), 21–2.

⁹⁴ I. Abrahams and S. Levy (eds.), *Macaulay on Jewish Disabilities* (Edinburgh, 1909), 10.

That a Jew should be a privy councillor to a Christian king would be an eternal disgrace to the nation. But the Jew may govern the money-market, and the money-market may govern the world. . . . The scrawl of the Jew on the back of a piece of paper may be worth more than the royal word of three kings, or the national faith of three new American republics. But that he should put Right Honourable before his name would be the most frightful of national calamities.⁹⁵

Given these qualifications, Gentile support for emancipation was double-edged. It did not represent the positive acceptance and validation of a Jewish presence but reflected more a recognition of the 'impracticability of exclusion' informed by wider constitutional or religious principles.⁹⁶ 'The emancipation of the Jews is but a natural step in the progress of civilisation,' wrote William Hazlitt in *The Tatler*; sympathy for the community was often merely a by-product.⁹⁷

These ambiguous Gentile attitudes were internalized by the minority and scarred the Anglo-Jewish consciousness.⁹⁸ Emancipation forced upon the Jew the realization of his degradation. Reinforced by the unexpectedly long struggle and its expedient rather than principled resolution, this imbued Jews with an identity paranoia. This, Cesarani states, 'meant that English Jewry still felt itself to be on trial' after emancipation.⁹⁹ Gentile equivocation was mitigated to some extent, however, by the positive aspects of equality. The minority had after all been included. Jews felt their status enhanced and their worth as citizens appreciated.¹⁰⁰ The campaign had been long but it had also been smooth; there was no backsliding or violence such as marred many continental experiences.¹⁰¹ This contradiction meant that emancipation could not resolve the dilemma it had produced. The settlement of 1858

⁹⁵ Ibid. 24.

⁹⁶ I. Finestein, 'Jewish Emancipationists in Victorian England: Self-Imposed Limits to Assimilation', in J. Frankel and S. Zipperstein (eds.), *Assimilation and Community: The Jews in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Cambridge, 1992), 46.

⁹⁷ Quoted in I. Finestein, 'Some Modern Themes in the Emancipation Debate in Early Victorian England', in idem, *Jewish Society* (London, 1993), 130.

⁹⁸ G. Alderman, 'English Jews or Jews of the English Persuasion? Reflections on the Emancipation of Anglo-Jewry', in P. Birnbaum and I. Katznelson (eds.), *Paths of Emancipation: Jews, States, and Citizenship* (Chichester, 1995), 138.

⁹⁹ D. Cesarani, 'British Jews', in R. Liedtke and S. Wendehorst (eds.), *The Emancipation of Catholics, Jews and Protestants: Minorities and the Nation State in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (London, 1998), 44.

¹⁰⁰ Endelman, *Radical Assimilation*, 1.

¹⁰¹ Endelman, 'Englishness', 242.

did not provide a solution to the accommodation of Jewish differences within British society; 'it had only altered the emphasis on how they were to be regulated and in what ways their differences would be defined.'¹⁰²

For Gentiles the debate had at heart been one regarding not Jewish but British definition: a preoccupation with the relationship between citizenship and nationality pervaded Christian discussion.¹⁰³ Using emancipation as a foil, rival conceptions of the nature of Britishness vied for realization. In this atmosphere the actual condition of the Jews was a secondary consideration and the demands made upon them were vague.¹⁰⁴ There was a general understanding that cultural diversity and minority particularism would not be tolerated. The proscription of these had been the *sine qua non* of European emancipation since the Count de Clermont-Tonnerre established the terms of French Jews' inclusion in 1789: 'The Jews should be denied everything as a nation, but granted everything as individuals . . . It is intolerable that the Jews should become a separate political formation or class in the country.'¹⁰⁵ Beyond this, though, 'what sorts of Jewish identification were legitimate and which should be discouraged was a recurrent debate both within Jewry and Gentile society'.¹⁰⁶

Perennial questions regarding the appropriate combination of Jewish tradition and English citizenship continued to be asked. Equality would narrow the parameters, reorienting Jewish definition toward the Anglicized end of the identity spectrum. But the dichotomy remained. Caught between competing elements the Jews had sought to downplay the significance of their existence, and therefore their inclusion, by associating themselves with other nonconformist groups.¹⁰⁷ This rhetoric clashed with everyday reality, however, which revealed Jewry as a peculiar phenomenon: integrated yet distinct, patriotic yet alien.¹⁰⁸ Emancipation had provided no structured space within which to be Jewish and it was unclear how the minority was supposed to resolve the contradictions suffusing its existence. What was normative Judaism

¹⁰² Cesarani, 'British Jews', 54. ¹⁰³ *Ibid.* 37.

¹⁰⁴ T. Endelman, 'Making Jews Modern: Some Jewish and Gentile Misunderstandings in the Age of Emancipation', in M. Raphael (ed.), *What is Modern about the Modern Jewish Experience?* (Williamsburg, Va., 1997), 20.

¹⁰⁵ The French National Assembly, 'Debate on the Eligibility of Jews for Citizenship', 23 Dec. 1789, in P. Mendes-Flohr and J. Reinharz (eds.), *The Jew in the Modern World: A Documentary History*, 2nd edn. (Oxford, 1995), 115.

¹⁰⁶ Feldman, *Englishmen*, 5. ¹⁰⁷ Finstein, 'Some Modern Themes', 143.

¹⁰⁸ Feldman, *Englishmen*, 77.

in this situation? Echoing Resettlement, emancipation left Anglo-Jewry with an indeterminacy of status. Jews still possessed remarkable freedom to decide the boundaries of their dual self-definition in Britain, but they were unsure and exceedingly self-conscious about the possibilities of doing so. The essential ambivalence of modern Jewish identity remained. In this uncertainty Anglo-Jewry entered the post-emancipation era.

2

Position and Politics

The First Jewish MPs

I

On 26 July 1858 Lionel de Rothschild entered the House of Commons to take his seat as the first professing Jewish Member of Parliament. It was a momentous occasion. Ending an eleven-year struggle to sit for the City of London (which had returned him five times), it also marked the culmination of Anglo-Jewry's emancipation. Although the act would have few practical implications for the community, as a principle the ability of Jews to enter Parliament was of massive importance. It was a symbol of their capacity to be Englishmen at the highest level and the recognition of this by their Gentile peers. Being able to participate in directing the future of England was the ultimate sign of Jewish acceptance. This continued to remain the case throughout the immediate post-emancipation period. In 1880 the *Jewish World (JW)* was still portraying the increasing number of Jewish parliamentary candidates as an indication of communal progress, proving how 'completely our sentiments are assimilated with those of the people amongst whom we live!'¹ For the community, the Jewish MP represented the archetype Jew, the very personification of their aspirations. But this was an ambivalent distinction. The terms of Jewish inclusion had been unclear. Jewish politicians were consequently faced with competing and contradictory expectations regarding their participation in British politics. They were required, by dint of good example, to demonstrate that Jews could be politically responsible and independent Englishmen, as much as (if not more than) the next MP—to be MPs of the Jewish persuasion; at times, though, they were also expected to bring a minority perspective

¹ *JW*, 19 Mar. 1880, 7.

to politics and support Jewry's specific needs—to be Jewish MPs.² The MPs themselves, like other Jews, were unsure of how to reconcile these expectations; unlike other Jews, though, the MPs were regularly forced to make a choice, to confront the quandaries of Jewish existence. Operating at a national level, their actions scrutinized alike by both Gentile and Jew, Jewish politicians were at the forefront of debates concerning Anglo-Jewry's place in English society and confronted the issues of Jewish identity especially acutely.

Their experiences have, though, largely escaped historiographical attention; there has been very little research on Jewish MPs or Jewish political activity between 1858 and 1887. Only two historical works exist that place questions concerning these topics at the centre of their study. The first was Geoffrey Alderman's *The Jewish Community in British Politics*; a work elucidating the relationship between Jewish voters and the British political system.³ In exploring this taboo subject, Alderman established the importance of political study for understanding Anglo-Jewry's development and highlighted several useful aspects of the relationship between Jewish political activity and Jewish identity. Notably, examining the employment of a Jewish vote, Alderman demonstrates the existence of a particularly Jewish dimension to British politics. The second work, David Feldman's *Englishmen and Jews: Social Relations and Political Culture, 1840–1914*, seeks to illuminate how Jewish social development and political activity influenced discourse concerning their place in British society.⁴ Reversing Alderman's focus, Feldman turns the Jewish presence in British politics inside out, showing that debates about Jewish identity in this period were also, essentially, debates about British identity. This approach is exceedingly useful—revealing the changing perceptions of Jews within the British polity and the consequences of their presence and interests on national political discussion. However, as a result of this focus, Feldman tends to lose sight of the Jews themselves. His evidence is drawn predominantly from Gentile sources, and the Jews' voices are too seldom heard.

² These two terms, Jewish MP and MP of the Jewish persuasion, will be used interchangeably throughout this work; unless, as above, specific connotations are implied by their deliberate use, which will be explained in the text. Otherwise, for the sake of convenience, the two terms will not be differentiated, a practice in conformity with their contemporary usage.

³ G. Alderman, *The Jewish Community in British Politics* (Oxford, 1983).

⁴ D. Feldman, *Englishmen and Jews: Social Relations and Political Culture, 1840–1914* (London, 1994).

Consequently, the ramifications of these issues on Jewish identity are often overlooked. Valuable as this and Alderman's work are, then, they by no means constitute a comprehensive examination of the relationship between political participation and Jewish identity, which, of course, was never their intention. One area considerably neglected, in this respect, is the activity of Jewish MPs. This chapter seeks to redress this omission.⁵

In analysing the actions and attitudes of Jewish MPs and their ramifications upon Anglo-Jewish identity this chapter adopts a tripartite structure. The first section initially assesses the nature of Jewish MPs as a group before proceeding to examine this group's activity as politicians, in regard to both performance and representation. It evaluates the MPs' experiences, particularly at constituency level, revealing the integrated nature of Jewish participation, which nonetheless maintained certain confessional specifics. The next two sections analyse, in turn, Jewish MPs' behaviour in respect to domestic political matters and issues of British foreign policy.⁶ The second part, detailing the MPs' attempts to obtain special legislative treatment for Jews in Britain and the role of Jewishness in determining their political opinions, shows how a distinctive Anglo-Jewish domestic agenda was beginning to emerge in this period. The section also considers how Jewish politicians dealt with the functioning of British politics: specifically, how their party allegiances developed. The final part extends this investigation to foreign affairs, discussing Jews' reaction to British policies and their own efforts on behalf of persecuted co-religionists abroad. Noting the formulaic and generally subordinate role Jewish issues played in comparison

⁵ Unfortunately, the scarcity of secondary research upon Anglo-Jewish MPs is echoed by a dearth of primary source information. Several contemporaneous biographies exist but few MPs left substantial personal holdings and some of those that did destroyed the overtly political records among these—as did the Rothschild family. Other records somewhat compensate for this, however: the better preserved holdings of many major political figures often contain records of their interaction with Jewish MPs; Hansard's proceedings detail their parliamentary activity; and local newspapers provide comment upon constituency activities.

⁶ The majority of Jewish politicians only concerned themselves with a very limited number of political topics, largely those with some implication for their religion and/or the great constitutional matters of nineteenth-century British politics: franchise reform; the Church (and Anglican privileges); and Ireland. Consequently, this work will focus upon these, with the addition of British foreign policy—also quite a popular topic among the politicians. Regarding these 'British' issues the selection is, of course, somewhat artificial, but as broad topics and ones that were the most prominent and contentious in contemporary politics, they perhaps offer the best opportunity to evaluate Jewry's position within national political discourse.

to English interests, this section highlights Jews' identification with national issues and the continuing contention concerning political Jewishness in Britain.

II

There were eighteen individual Jews who sat as Members of Parliament between 1858 and 1887. Lionel de Rothschild, having won the right, was the first in July 1858. In the next general election a year later, he was joined by two co-religionists. The Jewish presence in the legislature jumped to six in 1865; hovering between four and seven for the next two decades, it reached a peak of nine in the elections of 1885 and 1886: see Appendix 1. These Jewish MPs were a diverse group in both background and political activity, ranging from international banking magnates, like the Rothschilds, to obscure pottery manufacturers from Yorkshire, such as Stuart Woolf. Initially, though, as might be expected, men connected with finance dominated Jewish representation. All three MPs in 1859—a Rothschild, a Goldsmid, and David Salomons—derived their principal income from banking. Financiers continued to remain important throughout the period; members of the Cohen and Montagu banking dynasties joining scions of the Rothschild and Goldsmid ones in the 1880s. Comprising nine individuals, financiers were the largest occupational grouping among Jewish MPs of the period.⁷ Second to this was a legal group, which encompassed seven MPs. That barristers should form so comparatively large a contribution is not surprising. The ability to practise law had been a notable right gained during the emancipation campaign, and Jews pursuing their equality in this direction were also drawn to similar efforts in the political sphere—as the early presence of emancipationist Jews like Francis Goldsmid (the first Jewish barrister) and Salomons (the first Jewish magistrate) demonstrates.⁸ Over time,

⁷ See W. Rubinstein, 'Jewish Top Wealth-Holders in Britain, 1809–1909', *Jewish Historical Studies*, 37 (2001). Unsurprisingly, this financial group was exceedingly wealthy: six of them left liquid assets of over one million, most several million, pounds upon their deaths and another two left several hundred thousand. Rubinstein does not offer any information on the ninth, Montagu, who would most probably have also bequeathed a legacy of several millions. This is likely to have made them substantially wealthier than the majority of MPs.

⁸ Goldsmid and Salomons were simultaneously bankers and solicitors and have been counted in both occupational groups. They or their families owned banking businesses

though, the Jewish legal presence in the Commons was to become professionalized, through the entry of such men as George Jessel and Arthur Cohen—who had nationally recognized legal expertise. The remaining five MPs came from a variety of occupational backgrounds: there were three provincial industrialists, Woolf, colliery owner Saul Isaac, and lace manufacturer James Jacoby; an engineer in Lewis Isaacs; and the merchant, non-practising barrister, and politician Henry de Worms.

Irrespective of their background, few Jewish MPs were outstanding politicians. Commentaries and biographies (both contemporary and historiographical) are replete with lamentations regarding their inability to speak, their lack of involvement in debate, and their general inactivity in the House.⁹ Anglo-Jewry was far from emulating the political accomplishments of some European Jews; in France, for instance, Adolphe Crémieux and David Raynal both served as Interior Minister during this period.¹⁰ Only two Jews, Jessel and de Worms, attained government office in this period, a fact perhaps partly attributable to lingering prejudice but more likely a reflection of poor political performance connected to the lack of interest of busy career men, more concerned with stock markets or legal cases. Moreover, only de Worms, as Secretary to the Board of Trade (1885–6, 1886–8), held a political post. Jessel, as Solicitor General (1871–3), fulfilled primarily legal tasks.¹¹

The majority of Jewish MPs had far less notable parliamentary careers. Some died before gaining the opportunity: Frederick Goldsmid, for instance, elected in July 1865, expired the following March. Some seem to have been concerned only with regional political issues: James Jacoby spoke on only five occasions over 1885–7, of which four related to mining in his mid-Derbyshire constituency.¹² Others were simply not interested in parliamentary politics, as was the case with Lionel Mayer,

from which they drew the majority of their income, but both took up legal practice in order to further Jewish equality. The multi-talented de Worms has also been counted as a barrister, despite not practising.

⁹ See entries in P. Emden, *Jews of Britain: A Series of Biographies* (London, 1944), which tend to comment on the parliamentary performance of the MPs.

¹⁰ P. Birnbaum, 'Between Social and Political Assimilation: Remarks on the History of the Jews in France', in P. Birnbaum and I. Katznelson (eds.), *Paths of Emancipation: Jews, States, and Citizenship* (Chichester, 1995), 115.

¹¹ M. Jolles, *A Directory of Distinguished British Jews, 1830–1930: With Selected Compilations Extending from 1830 to 2000* (London, 2002), 85, 94.

¹² Hansard, 3rd Series, General Index 1883–6 and 1887.

and Nathaniel de Rothschild, who collectively spoke in the House only twice, restricting their activity to voting, infrequently. Ferdinand de Rothschild's record was little better. So anonymous was their presence in Parliament that the *Jewish Chronicle* publicly, if politely, complained of the impression of indifference it conveyed.¹³ Historians have been less kind, Alderman surmising in regard to Lionel: 'For the man at the centre of the battle the yoke he had won for himself proved too heavy.'¹⁴ But this is an unfair assessment, too heavily reliant upon performance in the Commons. Lionel and Nathaniel were keenly and actively interested in politics, if not in parliamentary participation. Rothschild political relations with the British establishment were from the beginning based on the family's economic standing.¹⁵ They did not need to cultivate influence in the House, being able to work more easily through the intimate world of Victorian politics: the City, the West End clubs, and society events. As Lionel's obituary noted: 'His inability to walk had long prevented him from taking part in any but the most important divisions, although Mr. Goschen had told the electors that from his writing-table in New Court Baron Lionel de Rothschild exerted more influence on their behalf than a much more active member could have done.'¹⁶ It was within this environment that the Rothschilds were politically influential, offering financial aid and advice, as well as information from their extensive continental contacts, to both Liberals and Tories.¹⁷ Their parliamentary presence was simply a matter of status, a reflection of their wealth and membership of the ruling class.¹⁸

There were many Jewish MPs, however, who took their role more seriously. Lily Montagu described her father's motivation for entering Parliament as recognition of the need to fulfil his social and civic responsibilities.¹⁹ Months before his first election Arthur Cohen detailed his resolve that if 'I could be of any real use to the [Liberal] party I

¹³ *JC*, 21 June 1878, 2. ¹⁴ Alderman, *Jewish Community*, 31.

¹⁵ D. Gutwein, *The Divided Elite: Economics, Politics and Anglo-Jewry, 1882–1917* (Leiden, 1992), 127.

¹⁶ *JC*, 6 June 1879, 11.

¹⁷ Bodleian Library, Hughenden Papers, 141/3, fos. 106–43, Letter from Nathaniel to Disraeli, 8 Dec. 1879.

¹⁸ Gutwein, *Divided Elite*, 126.

¹⁹ L. Montagu, *Samuel Montagu: First Baron Swaythling* (London, 1913), 66. Lily was Samuel's daughter and, though somewhat estranged, the historian must be careful of bias in this work, which is far from an objective account. Nevertheless, Montagu was known as a man with a strong sense of civic duty and the quote is probably little of an exaggeration.

would certainly stand', claiming that he did 'not care a jot about entering Parliament for any social consideration, nor for the purpose of getting a judgeship'.²⁰ In spite of these sentiments Montagu and Cohen, like so many other Jewish MPs, played little more than a peripheral part in British politics. Neither forsook their previous occupations, which consumed much more of their time and interest than Parliament. Their contributions to politics were predominately concerned with this work. The vast majority of Montagu's speeches involved topics such as currency exchange or bimetallism, whereas Cohen's contributions were predominately limited to discussing the legal technicalities of legislation. This was a familiar pattern for Jewish MPs, who tended, as a rule, to restrict their political activities to previous areas of expertise. Only de Worms abandoned all alternative interests in favour of concentrating upon a political career.

Given this general lack of political accomplishment among Jewish MPs it might be wondered why many were ever selected as candidates. The example of the Rothschilds provides a clue. Enormously rich, hugely influential, and very well known, their representation could endow any constituency with prestige and promise an increase in fortune. Irrespective of their potential legislative aptitude, the family's suitability for public life had been demonstrated by success in other areas, and this proved persuasive with electors. Mayer, for instance, appealed first and foremost to the economy of his Hythe constituents: 'By means of my business I hoped to be of service to you as a commercial community, situated as you are, the connecting link between this country and the various cities on the continent of Europe.'²¹ Although the Rothschild case was *sui generis*, virtually all Jewish MPs could boast success in business or a profession, and most had also participated in municipal office. Salomons justified his coming before Greenwich against a local man whose father had previously represented the borough on such terms:

He had been a magistrate for the County of Kent 22 years; he had filled the office of High Sheriff of the county also, and likewise the office of Lord Mayor

²⁰ Bodleian Library, Papers of Sir William Harcourt, MS Harcourt dep. 208, fos. 143–4, Letter from Cohen to Harcourt, 4 Nov. 1879. Again, there is the possibility of bias in this source: Cohen was attempting to become a Liberal candidate and was therefore trying to recommend himself to Harcourt. He later proved as good as his word, though, when in 1881 he refused a judgeship after Gladstone, not wanting to risk a by-election, persuaded him to stay.

²¹ Rothschild Archive, London, 000/235, Report of Mayer's Hythe election address, n.d. (c.1868).

of the City of London, and on retiring from the latter position had carried with him such a testimonial . . . which warranted him in seeking the suffrage of any metropolitan or other constituency in the kingdom.²²

Not all Jews could recount such an impressive record but most had occupied some position of note or authority. The group contained, *inter alia*, seven Deputy Lieutenants, one Lord Lieutenant, seven justices of the peace, three privy counsellors, two mayors, three QCs, two knights, three baronets, four foreign-titled barons, five sheriffs, and an alderman.²³ A surprising 50 per cent had received a university education, an achievement not particularly common in the wider Anglo-Jewish community.²⁴ The majority frequented London's most important political clubs: among those MPs with known associations were three Brooks's, one Carlton, and nine Reform members.²⁵

The contacts Jews established in these influential circles were to provide many with an entry into the political arena. Montagu, having worked for thirty-six years in the vicinity of Whitechapel, befriended the sitting MP and leaders of the local Liberal Council, who, upon the seat becoming vacant, wrote to him requesting he stand in their interest; until which point, Montagu claimed, he had not considered entering Parliament.²⁶ Lionel Cohen's political career was immensely boosted by his intimacy with Lord Randolph Churchill, who recommended him to other party figures and provided 'much prized and valued support' by appearing, occasionally with his mother in tow, at several of his election meetings.²⁷ These Jews were evidently at home in and, indeed, a part of the leading stratum of society. Having succeeded vocationally, participated in public life, and associated with elite figures, it was natural, from both their and others' perspectives, that they now enter politics. This would seem to apply as much to the lesser lights among the MPs, who operated at more provincial levels, as it does to eminent City Jews. The radical Liberal Association that invited Jacoby to contest Mid-Derbyshire was most impressed with his civic service in

²² *Kentish Mercury*, 12 Feb. 1859, 4.

²³ See entries in Jolles, *Directory*, and *Who's Who of British Members of Parliament*, i: 1832–85 and ii: 1886–1918 (Hassocks, 1976, 1978).

²⁴ See Jolles, *Directory*, and *Who's Who*. Three of these attended Cambridge, five graduated from UCL, and one studied at University College Frankfurt.

²⁵ See entries in *Who's Who*, i–ii.

²⁶ University of Southampton Library, MS 117, Papers of Lord Swaythling, Scrapbook of Press Cuttings, 4.

²⁷ Cambridge University Library, Papers of Lord Randolph Churchill, Add. MS 9248/5/604, Letter from Cohen to Churchill, 6 May 1885.

Nottinghamshire—where he had been a member of Nottingham town council for three years and also sheriff of the county—and countered hostility at his not being a local man by praising his record as at one time the youngest councillor in England.²⁸

It was at the local level that Jewish MPs were most politically successful. Few performed well upon the national stage but throughout the period they were generally assiduous representatives of their constituencies.²⁹ Most would raise local matters in Parliament and took care to frequently address their localities. In some cases these were actions of expediency. Salomons's attempts to win Greenwich from a native rival were based upon pledges to tackle local issues, such as the London coal tax and conservancy of the Thames.³⁰ But others seem to have genuinely enjoyed grass-roots politics. Mayer de Rothschild, who never spoke in the House, eagerly defended his seat against the Tories, undertaking 'very tiring' efforts in doing so: 'I have been hard at work all day canvassing at Hythe and the local districts & have found the people very largely in favour of your humble servant except when under the pressure of Squire Deeds.'³¹

This, in most instances, occasioned a good relationship between the two. Besides the indication of popularity provided by some MPs' impressive re-election success, for example, Lionel de Rothschild eight times for the City, John Simon four times for Dewsbury, David Salomons four times, and Francis Goldsmid three times—see Appendix 1—there are numerous other examples of their local support. Isaac was petitioned by residents of Nottingham to stand, and praised by the local Tory chairmen 'as a neighbour, as a friend, as an employer of labour, and as a bringer of money to Nottingham'. He was celebrated excessively, even by nineteenth-century standards, wherever he appeared: 'Mr. Isaac, on rising, was greeted with enthusiastic applause. The ladies waved their handkerchiefs, and the whole audience rose and cheered lustily for several minutes.'³² In Buckinghamshire the Rothschilds, a massive

²⁸ *Derby Reporter*, 16 Oct. 1885, 4. The paper claimed Jacoby held this record in 1876, at the age of 24.

²⁹ Jewish MPs represented a variety of constituencies with little similarity between them, though they were all in England: see Appendix 1. Apart from Lionel de Rothschild's City seat, Montagu was the only one to have a significant number of Jewish voters; see below.

³⁰ *Kentish Mercury*, 12 Feb. 1859, 4.

³¹ Rothschild Archive, London, XI/109/95, Sundry Private Correspondence, Letter from Mayer to his brothers and nephews, 16 Oct. 1868.

³² *Nottinghamshire Guardian*, 6 Feb. 1874, 2, 5.

electoral influence in the county due to their extensive landholdings, were returned with 'quasi-feudal fidelity'.³³ Nathaniel and Ferdinand seem to have had a particularly intimate connection with their constituents, Ferdinand declaring to cheers in 1885: 'I am living in your immediate neighbourhood—I may say that all of you are members of my family.'³⁴

This attachment was significantly augmented by Rothschild philanthropy, which funded many a public improvement in Buckinghamshire. The goodwill such charity generated is difficult to overestimate: when Nathaniel presented a new building to the Aylesbury Literary Institution in 1880, the editor of the district paper compared it to the 'tale of Aladdin and his wonderful lamp'. Another local offered a more realistic assessment: 'Sir Nathaniel manifested great interest in the town and neighbourhood; he spent money freely, and when they looked at their educational institutions and his efforts for the working men especially he said Sir Nathaniel had a great claim on their gratitude.'³⁵ Several other Jewish MPs similarly utilized largesse to supplement their popularity: Francis Goldsmid was famous for his generosity, which included a £5,000 donation towards Reading's new town hall.³⁶ Montagu made much of the £1,000 he had given to constitute an East End apprenticing fund during his 1886 election campaign.³⁷

This is not to suggest that Jewish MPs had an easy life. Like all politicians they regularly encountered dissent and were at times pressured to support policies or deliver promises they were not keen on. In many Liberal constituencies this often seems to have entailed placating nonconformist voters. Nathaniel was urged by his dissenting audiences to support the abolition of Church rates and later the abrogation of Clause 25, issues about which he himself was ambivalent.³⁸ His successor Ferdinand enthusiastically attested the merits of temperance to similarly appease this group.³⁹ Failure to sufficiently propitiate local opinion cost some MPs popularity. Greenwich radicals publicly censured Salomons

³³ R. Gibbs, *A History of Aylesbury with its Borough and Hundreds, the Hamlet of Watton, and the Electoral Division* (Aylesbury, 1885), 300, and Gutwein, *Divided Elite*, 126.

³⁴ *Bucks Advertiser and Aylesbury News*, 21 Nov. 1885, 3.

³⁵ Centre for Buckinghamshire Studies, Papers of Robert Gibbs, D15/4/1, Scrapbook.

³⁶ A. Löwy and D. Marks, *A Memoir of Sir Francis Henry Goldsmid*, 2nd edn. (London, 1882), 139.

³⁷ University of Southampton Library, MS 117, Papers of Lord Swaythling, Scrapbook of Press Cuttings, 67.

³⁸ *Bucks Advertiser and Aylesbury News*, 15 July 1865, 2, and 31 Jan. 1874, 3.

³⁹ *Ibid.* 31 Oct. 1885, 7.

for neglecting the borough's interests in 1870. Interrupting a proposed vote of confidence at a constituency gathering they moved:

That this meeting is of opinion that Sir David Salomons has regarded the interests of the Corporation of the City of London, of which he is an alderman, as superior to the claims of the local interests of Greenwich, Woolwich and Deptford; that he has not consistently adhered to the pledges upon which the nonconformists of the borough gave him their support.⁴⁰

This was a product of the distressed state of the borough, which had recently suffered the loss of a major employer when the Liberal government closed its dockyards. Salomons, who had always faced hostility to his London origins in a borough still ambivalent about its metropolitan identity, had for years done little to prevent this eventuality; in 1865 he twice avoided a deputation of dockyard workers seeking his assistance and upon finally meeting a third, duly fell asleep mid discussion.⁴¹

The biggest problems for Jewish MPs regarding constituency protest came from local Liberal Associations. Arthur Cohen and Ferdinand both faced a 'fratricidal challenge' in the 1880s from rival Liberal candidates put up by local Associations in an attempt to dominate the party.⁴² But it was Simon who faced by far the greatest threat. Specifically invited by 'real Liberal' working men to contest the new seat of Dewsbury against another Liberal candidate chosen by a committee (which would become the Association), he faced contention from the start.⁴³ Simon triumphed in 1868 but could not unite the party, and his 1871 refusal to submit his candidacy to the Association's approval sparked nine years of intra-party conflict. In 1874 'ultra-Radicals' disturbed his meetings, organized rival gatherings, and sponsored an alternative candidate, as Dewsbury became 'a house divided against itself'.⁴⁴ Simon lambasted his opponents as a clique: 'A few Liberals activated by personal spite, and by a feeling of revenge on being defeated, were presuming to dictate to the party throughout the borough as to who they could have as their member.'⁴⁵ But in 1880, despite eleven years of representation and

⁴⁰ *The Times*, 29 Sept. 1870, 12.

⁴¹ *Kentish Mercury*, 1 July 1865, no page. For more information on how localized area identities influenced late nineteenth-century London politics see J. Davis, *Reforming London: The Government Problem, 1855–1900* (Oxford, 1988).

⁴² For Rothschild see *Bucks Advertiser and Aylesbury News*, 3 July 1886, 7; and for Cohen *JC*, 19 Mar. 1880, 3.

⁴³ C. James, *M.P. for Dewsbury* (Brighouse, 1970), 10–11.

⁴⁴ *Dewsbury Chronicle*, 31 Jan. 1874, 8, and 20 Mar. 1880, 8.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.* 20 Mar. 1880, 8.

letters of recommendation from prominent Liberals, he was only just re-elected with a 345-vote majority.⁴⁶

The worst case of internecine strife was experienced by the most politically active of Jewish MPs, Henry de Worms, whose selection, success, and eventual secession from the seat of Greenwich provide an excellent example of the multifarious experiences of Jews in constituency politics. De Worms, who unsuccessfully contested Sandwich in 1868, had gained political notoriety in the late 1870s with a series of books and lecture tours defending 'Beaconsfieldism' and promoting an aggressive foreign policy. The electors of Greenwich, feeling ill used by the Liberals, were casting around for a Tory candidate and sent a deputation soliciting his candidacy.⁴⁷ Eager to enter Parliament, de Worms canvassed the borough and met with much success, his national outlook complementing local concerns much better than had his uncle's (Salomons): 'The peace-at-any-price party wished to see their great arsenal closed and converted into tea gardens (laughter).'⁴⁸ He was easily elected, missing the top of the poll by merely three votes.⁴⁹

The next four years proceeded peacefully, but the division of the borough into three single-member constituencies—the safe Tory seats of Greenwich and Woolwich, and the open Deptford—following the 1885 Redistribution Act precipitated a Conservative civil war. De Worms, attending what was ostensibly only a lecture of the Greenwich Conservative Club at their local public house, was presented with a unanimous resolution in favour of him representing Greenwich, which he 'unhesitatingly accepted'.⁵⁰ Two days later, a meeting of the Greenwich Conservative Association, which de Worms did not patronize, assigned instead his fellow MP, Mr Boord, to Greenwich, gave Woolwich to de Worms's former election agent Mr Hughes, and left him with Deptford. A bitter dispute ensued, dominating parochial concerns and splitting local opinion, as neither side would submit.⁵¹ Boord asserted

⁴⁶ Ibid. 3 Apr. 1880, 8. This was out of a total 8,439 votes polled. Simon had letters of support from Hugh Childers, John Bright, and even Joseph Chamberlain, the Liberal Association's head. In 1885 he was the only Liberal candidate.

⁴⁷ *Kentish Mercury*, 13 Mar. 1880, no page.

⁴⁸ Ibid. 27 Mar. 1880, 3.

⁴⁹ Ibid. 3 Apr. 1880, 5. De Worms's achievement is more impressive when it is considered that this was his first election, compared to the third for his fellow Tory who came top.

⁵⁰ *The Times*, 11 Dec. 1884, 4.

⁵¹ The local press was divided in its loyalties: the *Kentish Mercury* favoured de Worms, whereas its rival the *Kentish Independent* backed Boord. *The Times*, where bitter correspondence was exchanged for some months, attempted to maintain a neutral stance.

his seniority in Greenwich and criticized de Worms's tactics: 'This supposed representative meeting was a mere lecture taken advantage of by the Baron and his friends.'⁵² Hughes attempted to smear his reputation, accusing de Worms of paying illegal claims during the 1868 Sandwich campaign.⁵³ De Worms retaliated, suing Hughes for libel and denouncing the caucus's tyranny of selection: 'I entirely repudiate the principle that a candidate has, either by seniority or predilection, the prescriptive right of choosing his constituency.'⁵⁴ After ten months of acrimony—all ameliorative efforts, including arbitration by senior party figures, having failed—de Worms suddenly withdrew his candidacy: a move motivated, seemingly, not by fear of political defeat but the duty of success:

In deciding to take the step of retiring his candidature for Greenwich, he felt that in the responsible position he had accepted as a Minister of the Crown he could neither measure swords with one whom he considered immeasurably beneath him . . . nor could he take upon himself the responsibility of splitting the Conservative vote.⁵⁵

No doubt the prospect of a safer seat elsewhere sweetened this decision. Only days after withdrawing de Worms was addressing East Toxteth, his new constituency, selected from some fourteen that had offered him refuge.⁵⁶ Specifically targeted by the chairmen of the Liverpool Constitutional Association, in preferment to several local men, de Worms was welcomed on Merseyside as a 'distinguished and statesmanlike politician'; emphatically returned in 1885, he was to represent the seat for the next seventeen years until elevated to the peerage.⁵⁷

So far, these experiences were probably typical for many MPs and do much to demonstrate how easily Jews operated within and integrated into British political life. There were, though, occasions when Jews met opposition specifically because of their religious confession. The candidature of Salomons in Greenwich in 1859 provoked accusations of 'Judaistical tricks'; Mayer's victory at Hythe in the same election witnessed the parish church refuse to permit the customary

⁵² *The Times*, 18 Dec. 1884, 9.

⁵³ *Kentish Mercury*, 23 Jan. 1885, 5.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.* 16 Jan. 1885, 4, and 26 June 1885, 5. The case was settled in de Worms's favour after a jury deliberation of three minutes. Hughes was ordered to pay £500 damages and costs.

⁵⁵ *Kentish Independent*, 19 Sept. 1885, no page.

⁵⁶ *Liverpool Courier*, 18 Sept. 1885, 4.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.* and P. Waller, *Democracy and Sectarianism: A Political and Social History of Liverpool, 1868–1939* (Liverpool, 1981), 65.

bell-ringing.⁵⁸ Julian Goldsmid suffered the worst treatment of the period during the 1870 Rochester by-election. He had come to Rochester with previous parliamentary experience and was selected, out of eleven applicants, to replace the deceased member by an ‘overwhelming majority’ of the local Liberal party.⁵⁹ Conservative supporters immediately instigated a campaign of stereotyping—attacking him as a man devoted to commerce and denigrating the validity of Old Testament religion.⁶⁰ Goldsmid, openly baited on the nomination platform, sought to rise above such sordidness. ‘Our opponent has in a somewhat illiberal sentence objected to me on account of my religious opinions. I am rather proud of that, because it shows he cannot object to me on any other ground. . . . My religious opinions are not a question for him but for me alone.’⁶¹ This drew a derisive shout from the crowd—‘What have you done with Lazarus?’—which occasioned considerable laughter. It was rapidly followed by similar interjections: shouts of ‘Jew, Jew’ and ‘who sold the saviour?’⁶² Unfortunately for Goldsmid, such sentiments were not confined to the borough’s Conservatives. As the local Tory paper observed, with a certain amount of *schadenfreude*, he had proved an injudicious choice for Rochester Liberals: ‘That a feeling of aversion to such a selection was aroused in the minds of the independent portion of the Liberals must be acknowledged.’⁶³ The poll testified to the accuracy of this claim: despite the support of the party and sitting MP, Goldsmid received approximately 500 fewer votes than his predecessor had in 1868.⁶⁴ The paper, through a series of annoyed correspondents, subsequently entertained requests for the organization of an apolitical voting league ‘with the object of obtaining the seat for a Christian representative’.⁶⁵ Although this never materialized, Goldsmid was unable to overcome the city’s prejudice. He was re-elected on a combined ticket in 1874, when there was little serious opposition, but the depth of feeling against him was evident again in 1880, when, despite being the senior member in an

⁵⁸ M. Salbstein, *The Emancipation of the Jews in Britain: The Question of the Admission of the Jews to Parliament, 1828–1860* (London, 1982), 216, and *Kentish Mercury*, 13 Feb. 1859, 3.

⁵⁹ *Rochester and Chatham Journal and Mid-Kent Advertiser*, 16 July 1870, 4.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.* 23 July 1870, 3.

⁶¹ *Ibid.* 16 July 1870, 3.

⁶² *Ibid.* 23 July 1870, 3.

⁶³ *Ibid.* 4.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.* The Liberal candidate had polled 1,458 votes in 1868; Goldsmid gained 987 in 1870, managing only a 437 majority over his independent rival who had been in the field just two days.

⁶⁵ *Rochester and Chatham Journal and Mid-Kent Advertiser*, 30 July 1870, 3.

election that produced a general Liberal victory, he came bottom of the poll.⁶⁶

Such politically sparked anti-Jewish incidents continued throughout this period; Ferdinand encountered some in 1885. But they were noticeable primarily because of their scarcity.⁶⁷ These events were isolated and small scale, and seem even more so when compared to the pervasive and increasingly organized political anti-Semitism that confronted many other Jewish communities at this time. German Jews, for example, were enduring, *inter alia*, Adolf Stoecker's Christian Social Party's racist campaign to bar them from state positions and the beginning of their *de facto* exclusion from public administration.⁶⁸ Anti-Jewish sentiment in Britain traditionally lacked political resonance.⁶⁹ In each event the Jewish candidate was elected and expressions of support easily dwarfed those of hostility. Jewishness was evidently not an insurmountable problem in constituency politics, even if occasionally it was an issue. Some MPs, in fact, exploited it to their advantage. Both Francis Goldsmid and Salomons talked up their Jewish allegiance and the hardship attendant to it, in a bid to associate themselves with the cause of freedom. This was certainly appreciated by the voters of Greenwich, where several election songs were composed to propagate the theme:

Success to the worthy alderman!
Who has been tried and prov'd;
Known to this borough as the man
For worthy deeds, approv'd.
He is well vers'd in all we need
To do the borough good
From disability now freed
He is with zeal imbued
Choose him to represent us now

⁶⁶ *Rochester and Chatham Journal and Mid-Kent Advertiser*, 31 Jan. 1874, no page, and 27 Mar. 1880, no page.

⁶⁷ *Bucks Advertiser and Aylesbury News*, 5 Dec. 1885, 4. The Tory candidate apparently used inappropriate racial innuendo and described Rothschild as a Shylock character; on account of which the inhabitants of Waddesdon stoned him when he entered the village. There was also an isolated episode on polling day in the village of Missenden, where a placard was hawked around the streets proclaiming: 'Who persecuted Christ? The Jews.'

⁶⁸ W. Mosse, 'From Schutzjuden to Deutsche Staatsbürger Jüdischen Glaubens: The Long and Bumpy Road of Jewish Emancipation in Germany', in Birnbaum and Katznelson (eds.), *Paths of Emancipation*, 88–90.

⁶⁹ T. Endelman, 'The Englishness of Jewish Modernity in England', in J. Katz (ed.), *Toward Modernity: The European Jewish Model* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1987), 237.

He's free as you or me,
 Choose Salomons, and he'll soon show
 He prizes liberty
 He sought his own, He'll seek yours too
 He'll not two faces wear
 But shine in Parliament to show
 He is no truckler there.⁷⁰

The most overt use of Jewishness to gain political credit was, understandably, undertaken by Montagu. With an electorate estimated by local Liberals as nearly 50 per cent Jewish, Montagu's membership of and beneficence toward the community naturally featured heavily in his electioneering.⁷¹

These politically designed Jewish appeals were controversial. Montagu's campaign elicited criticism from his Tory opponents, who styled him the 'Hebrew candidate' and intimated that he was more concerned with Jewish interests than Liberal policies.⁷² Fellow Jewish MP L. Cohen also took issue with Montagu's tactics and wrote to the *JC* in complaint. Describing his own refusal to advertise Jewishness in pursuance of electoral ambitions, he 'held it objectionable personally to appeal to my Jewish brethren *as Jews* on behalf of any Jewish candidate, in any political contest which affects them only in common with their fellow-countrymen at large'.⁷³ Cohen's objections were not an isolated outburst but formed part of a perennial communal debate concerning the propriety and possibility of Jewish MPs appealing to and representing their co-religionists, *qua Jews*, in the political sphere. Montagu's Whitechapel was a flashpoint for discussion in the late 1880s but it had a significant Jewish community that could justify a certain sectarian approach. Virtually all other Jewish politicians sat for constituencies with either non-existent or exceedingly small Jewish electorates. Their basis of authority, as politicians, was derived from sources wholly external to Jewry.

What relationship, then, connected them to Anglo-Jewry? On the simplest level was the fact that all retained some form of affiliation with the community, that they were all professing Jews.⁷⁴ This was

⁷⁰ Greenwich Local Archives, 'Salomons, the Friend of the People', 1859.

⁷¹ University of Southampton Library, MS 117, Papers of Lord Swaythling, Scrapbook of Press Cuttings, 4.

⁷² *Ibid.* 17. ⁷³ *JC*, 20 Nov. 1885, 6. Emphasis in original.

⁷⁴ In examining Jewish MPs and their link to Jewish identity this work has eschewed comment upon MPs who were Jewish converts. There seems to have been little or no

the one commonality uniting an otherwise disparate group of individuals. Reflecting the situation within the community, this identification was far from homogeneous. Among the MPs levels of commitment varied considerably, from the strictly Orthodox faith of Montagu to the nominal affiliation of Jessel. There were also four MPs who practised Reform: Francis, Frederick, and Julian Goldsmid, and John Simon. Similarly divergent were the MPs' attachment to and position within the community. Some were located at the very top of the establishment, being members of the ruling Cousinhood: Lionel Cohen, for instance, was President of the Jewish Board of Guardians 1869–87. Others were involved at a lower level, such as Saul Isaac and Simon, who were both Board of Deputies representatives and sat on the Council of the Anglo-Jewish Association. Only Sidney Woolf, merely a synagogue member, and Lewis Isaacs, a retired secretary of the Jewish Youths' Benevolent Society, seem to have had no active connection with the Anglo-Jewish establishment in this period.⁷⁵

There were thus gradations to the MPs' Jewishness. Such subtleties were, however, lost upon Gentiles. The solidarity of Jewry in the popular mind meant that merely by being Jewish the MPs were perceived as exponents of communal opinion. 'Every movement and every vote of theirs will be identified with the community, and the latter held morally responsible for their public acts,' the *JC* realized.⁷⁶ In parliamentary debates relating to Jewish issues, Gentile politicians would look to them. When such issues occasioned party argument both sides attempted to use their Jewish politicians to adduce communal support for their positions.⁷⁷ Most Gentile politicians, to some extent, believed Jewish MPs 'spoke with great weight and authority as representatives of the Jewish community'.⁷⁸

contact between the two groups and converts would constitute a separate factor too tangential to pursue here. This exclusion includes discussion of Benjamin Disraeli's Jewish identification, which has already received much historical comment. Henry de Worms, however, who converted to Christianity shortly before his death, has been included: for this period and much of his life he was a dedicated Jew; his conversion was secret and, seemingly, the result of growing exclusion from the communal hierarchy combined with his wife's dying wish, rather than theological conviction.

⁷⁵ Jolles, *Directory*, 84, 93. So slender was Isaacs's connection to the community that in 1885 he requested that his name be omitted from a list of Jewish MPs the *Jewish Chronicle* was preparing.

⁷⁶ *JC*, 8 Feb. 1861, 4.

⁷⁷ Hansard, 3 Mar. 1882, cclxvii, cols. 39–40, 45–6.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, col. 63. The quote is Charles Dilke's.

The community was at times concerned about this association. There was always the possibility that Jewish actions in Parliament might negatively reflect upon other Jews, as had happened to an extent even, despite his conversion, with Disraeli. As a result, the links between MPs and the community were officially played down in the Jewish press. The *JC* and *JW*, throughout the period, routinely stated that Jewish MPs did not represent any 'organised politico-religious party', or, indeed, that there was any such thing as a 'Jewish Member of Parliament'.⁷⁹ Communal institutions, particularly the Board of Deputies, were viewed as the most appropriate channel through which to make Jewish political interests known. Parliamentary politics were a separate matter, where MPs had no mandate for Jewish issues. Many, therefore, took no political interest in the minority's affairs. They behaved as politicians of the Jewish persuasion. For the most part, though, Anglo-Jewry viewed their affiliation with Jewish politicians as a benefit. Jewish MPs were seen as 'worthy representatives' who would creditably uphold the name of Jew in public

and by this means lessen in the best way whatever prejudices against them still linger in the popular mind. . . . A career like that of the late Sir Francis Goldsmid was in itself a standing protest against the world's ill opinion of Jews, and did much to prevent such a protest being any longer needed.⁸⁰

The MPs' representative nature also meant that they served the community as useful indicators of tolerance. That Gentiles elected them as Jews, and did so increasingly over the period, suggested to both the *JC* and *JW* a growing integration: 'That we have made enormous strides in social progress must be evident when it is observed how numerous are the Jewish candidates for Parliamentary honours.'⁸¹ The number of Jewish MPs became an index of Jewry's acceptance. Precisely because of this, the community did not want the MPs to speak for it, to appear as the parliamentary arm of British Jewry.⁸² However, the community did expect them to watch over its interests. The *JC*, rejecting the possibility of completely severing 'synagogue and life', would remind MPs that 'besides the constituency that elected him, he has also to represent another, not by virtue of his choice, but of his birth'.⁸³ Claiming that

⁷⁹ *JC*, 9 Apr. 1880, 9 and *JW*, 12 Mar. 1880, 5.

⁸⁰ *JC*, 9 Apr. 1880, 3, and 13 Nov. 1885, 9.

⁸¹ *JW*, 2 Apr. 1880, 4. For a *JC* example see 28 July 1865, 4.

⁸² G. Alderman, *Modern British Jewry*, 2nd edn. (Oxford, 1998), 65.

⁸³ *JC*, 8 Feb. 1860, 4.

Jewish politicians had a responsibility to other Jews, the paper admitted that the Board could only achieve so much, and that the communal voice be heard in Parliament depended to 'great extent' on them.⁸⁴ Some were happy to shoulder this responsibility. MPs like Salomons, Francis Goldsmid 'the member for Jewry', Simon who took over this mantle upon Goldsmid's death, de Worms, and to a lesser extent A. Cohen and Montagu spent time and effort furthering Jewish interests, both large and small, domestic and foreign, in the House. In pursuing this political representation of Jewishness, the politicians acted as Jewish MPs. There were, of course, limits to this. It was an impression the politicians wished to avoid and on several occasions Salomons and Simon 'were careful to inform assemblages of Jews that they were not members of Parliament for the Jews'.⁸⁵ It also occurred within very circumscribed boundaries and under particular restrictions, as the next two sections will elucidate.

III

Domestically, little legislation directly affected Jews as Jews in this period. The Jewish United Synagogues Act of July 1870 was the only item that dealt exclusively with the community. Purely a matter of internal organization—it confirmed the scheme of the charity commissioner providing for the amalgamation of the main Ashkenazi synagogues—the Act was not contentious and occasioned no debate.⁸⁶ Jewish MPs had not needed to speak upon the subject. However, there were several issues during this period in which Jews, to varying degrees, felt compelled to intervene in order to safeguard their religious specificity, notably Sunday Bills, particularly those prohibiting work; religious education; and marriage regulations. Doing so was contentious. The Liberal fantasy of emancipation had anticipated the blurring of minority–majority differences since Wilhelm von Dohm's 1781 treatise argued that equality—encouraging Jews 'civic betterment'—would lead to the fusion of their interests with those of Christians.⁸⁷ It was an assumption that the principal Jewish emancipationists, who were

⁸⁴ *JC*, 4 Feb. 1870, 9.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.* 24 June 1870, 9.

⁸⁶ Hansard, May–Aug. 1870, cci–cciii, and University of Southampton Library, MS 148/2, Papers of P. Goldberg, United Synagogue: Official Documents and Reports.

⁸⁷ Mosse, 'From Schutzjuden to Deutsche Staatsbürger', 65. See also C. W. von Dohm, *Über die Bürgerliche Verbesserung der Juden* (Berlin, 1781).

also the community's original MPs, did much to facilitate. Men like Salomons, L. de Rothschild, and Francis Goldsmid had desired complete equalization before the law and sought to ensure that no feature of Jewish life impinged upon English ones. To this end they were willing to sacrifice aspects of religious particularity, accepting, as mentioned in the previous chapter, the loss of rabbinical control over divorce brought about by the 1857 Matrimonial Causes Act.⁸⁸

This remained the official attitude after emancipation. The *JC* declared in 1865: 'As a religious body we require nothing from the government.'⁸⁹ But underneath there had been a subtle shift in opinion. This assertion was followed by a sentence that hints at the change: 'Let by all means the Church and Rome contend for supremacy; let Dissent wrangle with her equality; the Synagogue just wants to be left alone.'⁹⁰ Not only does this establish Anglo-Jewry as a specific polity but it admits that, as such, the community had political requirements, namely non-interference in its religion. This view crystallized in the early 1870s when Gladstone's first ministry sought to implement a programme of overdue domestic reform. This encompassed a raft of issues from local government to Irish Church disestablishment, but many, such as the inauguration of a national education system, promoted collectivist measures, thereby afflicting Jews with a host of regulations highlighting their peculiarity.⁹¹ By 1874 the *JC* had become more truculent, calling for 'jealous vigilance' lest the legislature unintentionally prove prejudicial to Jews' sacred interests as an 'exceptional people'.⁹² Jewish MPs, understanding their special representative role, were prepared to provide it. Over the period they undertook action ranging from verbal protest to delivering petitions, proposing amendments, and introducing Bills to protect Jewish interests.

Remarkably, this was done initially by MPs who had, prior to emancipation, advocated strict equality. Salomons, once the leading protagonist against Jewish separatism, was by 1871 introducing a Bill designed solely to exempt Jews from general legislation. His Workshop Regulation Act Amendment would affect, he replied to a question, very

⁸⁸ I. Finestein, 'The Jews and the English Marriage Law during the Emancipation', in idem, *Jewish Society in Victorian England* (London, 1993), 55, 67–8.

⁸⁹ *JC*, 28 July 1865, 4. ⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

⁹¹ D. Cesarani, 'British Jews', in R. Liedtke and S. Wendehorst (eds.), *The Emancipation of Catholics, Jews and Protestants: Minorities and the Nation State in Nineteenth Century Europe* (Manchester, 1999), 49.

⁹² *JC*, 6 Feb. 1874, 753.

few non-Jews: it 'was only intended to assist the poorest class of Jewish employers and Jewish workmen who keep their Sabbath'.⁹³ The community had been pushing for such a provision since the passage of the 1867 Factory and Workshops Acts, which, prohibiting the employment of women and children on the Christian 'man-made' Sabbath, disadvantaged many Jews, who, observing their own day of rest on Saturday, were perforce limited to a five-day working week.⁹⁴ The *JC* had long castigated this arrangement and it praised Salomons's effort as 'the first endeavour made by a Member of Parliament of the Jewish faith to obtain from the legislature the mitigation of a hardship affecting the Jewish industrial classes'.⁹⁵ It was not to be the last; Jewish MPs continued to press similar claims throughout the entire period. Post-emancipation, Jews felt justified in protesting if national legislation compromised their religion, even though this meant perpetuating a level of exceptionalism.

This was a significant departure. Jews seeking special privileges, to have their otherness protected by the law, was a considerable reassessment of their presence in society. The dynamic of pre-emancipation acculturation was tempered: there were obviously limits to assimilation. It might even be suggested that the community sought to reverse this trend, for their desire to maintain a certain speciality was not limited to contemporary legislation but extended retrospectively to correct measures existing prior to emancipation.

The most striking example of this was the *JC*'s fervent and long-standing agitation in favour of passing a Marriage to a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill. Such Bills—a constant feature of parliamentary business throughout this period, being considered every two or three years, if not more frequently—were designed to legalize unions between widowers and their sisters-in-law that had been officially outlawed by the 1835 Marriage Act. This conjugal prohibition, based upon Anglican interpretations of Scripture, was perfectly permissible according to Jewish law and not uncommon in many communities.⁹⁶ The *JC* first protested the stricture in 1849; by the late 1860s complaints against it had become a regular feature of editorials.⁹⁷ The paper's initial arguments were based upon religious grounds: 'The only safe basis in this matter is not to go beyond scripture, precisely as the rabbis have done.'⁹⁸ But these gave way to less moderate reasoning as successive attempts at relief

⁹³ Hansard, 17 Mar. 1871, ccv, col. 174.

⁹⁴ *JC*, 3 June 1870, 9.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.* 19 May 1871, 6.

⁹⁶ Finestein, 'The Jews', 58–9.

⁹⁷ *JC*, 25 May 1849, 265–6.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.* 9 Mar. 1866, 4.

were denied: 'We need not here insist on the great advantages that would accrue to social happiness and public morality by a repeal of what we must characterise without affectation or exaggeration as a hideous law.'⁹⁹

Jewish objections were not isolated; they supplemented a considerable agitation led by nonconformists. So widespread was the demand for reform, in fact, that by the early 1870s the Liberal party had come to endorse it and Bills seeking to enact change routinely passed the Commons.¹⁰⁰ The *JC* was happy to associate the community's cause with that of other protesters but made no mistake in asserting that its sole interest lay in the restoration of Jewish particularity: 'We . . . contend that whatever else may be done, an exception should be made in favour of the Jews.'¹⁰¹ To this end, it urged Jewish MPs to push the issue in the House, trusting that no 'false delicacy' would inhibit them.¹⁰² Most MPs did vote in favour of the various Bills attempting legalization; Jessel also presented the House with a petition from Jewish ministers, but they were not moved to do more, and Simon alone spoke in favour of the issue.¹⁰³ Moreover, his arguments were general; whilst they utilized Jewish examples to prove that the law had no detrimental moral impact, they were pitched in support of comprehensive relief rather than merely Jewish exemption. 'He protested against the authority of an ecclesiastical law which at least one-half of the people of this country did not recognise.'¹⁰⁴ After this Bill failed, Simon never spoke on the subject again.

The MPs were less willing than the *JC* to construct a legal enclave. In a more responsible position, they were less sanguine about their Jewishness and far more timid in its expression. They would have noted John Bright's comparison of the emotion driving parliamentary opposition to any change with the sentimentality that had denied Jews admission to Parliament.¹⁰⁵ Perhaps more of a concern would have been the continuous resistance espoused by *The Times*, which, eschewing theological exegesis, characterized the movement as a destabilizing minority: 'In short, we are convinced the country, on the whole, is

⁹⁹ Ibid. 24 Nov. 1871, 9.

¹⁰⁰ *The Times*, 16 Feb. 1871, 9.

¹⁰¹ *JC*, 26 Feb. 1869, 4.

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ Ibid. 15 Mar. 1872, 9, and Hansard, 21 Feb. 1872, ccix, col. 846, and 17 Feb. 1875, ccxxii, col. 467.

¹⁰⁴ Hansard, 17 Feb 1875, ccxxii, col. 468. Realistically, of course, by the late 1860s, with Bills regularly passing the Commons but consistently defeated in the Lords, there was little Jewish MPs could do to further its realization. Their vocal support might have added further moral pressure though, and would certainly have done much to placate communal opinion.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid. 21 Apr. 1869, cxv, col. 1313.

perfectly satisfied with the existing law, and we strongly deprecate an agitation which . . . can only serve to unsettle the minds of persons with respect to one of the most fundamental conditions of social order.'¹⁰⁶ In this atmosphere Jewish MPs preferred to downplay the specificity of their requests, to approach the issue as one of general principle, identifying with other protagonists and, in effect, disguising the appeal they were making.¹⁰⁷ Evidently, in politics, Jewry's post-emancipation existence as a special interest group was to be circumscribed.

It was also to come at a price. Representing Jewry incurred responsibilities as well as opportunities. Viewed as communal paragons, Jewish MPs had to be ultra-careful of the image they presented; but beyond this the safeguarding of Christian feeling was a particular priority. Reaction to Jewish emancipation had centred on the fear that it would damage the interrelations of Christianity, the nation, and political authority.¹⁰⁸ The burden of proof lay upon Jewish MPs. The community had no desire to be catalysts for a transformation in the political order, to be symbols of religious indifference, and it was understood that any possibly de-Christianizing implications were to be avoided.¹⁰⁹ The necessity for this was apparent early on in the period. In March 1860, debating the Religious Worship Bill, Lord Robert Cecil claimed that due to the presence of Jews 'there was no longer any community between the Christian religion and the House of Commons', which consequently had no right to discuss Christianity or quote from the Bible.¹¹⁰ Francis Goldsmid was quick to refute him, politely upbraiding Cecil for not comprehending how it was possible for 'a member of the Jewish persuasion to combine attachment to his own faith with a wish that persons born in the Christian faith should be instructed in the doctrines of that religion'.¹¹¹ He continued to claim that, in fact, Jews viewed 'with favour rather than the contrary' measures to increase provision of Christian worship.¹¹² Despite the somewhat ridiculous position of

¹⁰⁶ *The Times*, 3 May 1866, 10.

¹⁰⁷ This was a tactic often utilized by Jewish MPs when seeking exceptional measures. One much-employed tool of this was the use of Gentile support: Salomons's Workshop Bill had been co-brought by three non-Jewish MPs.

¹⁰⁸ Feldman, *Englishmen*, 35–6, 41–2.

¹⁰⁹ I. Finestein, 'Post-Emancipation Jewry: The Anglo-Jewish Experience', in *idem*, *Jewish Society*, 170.

¹¹⁰ Hansard, 14 Mar. 1860, clvii, col. 520.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, col. 521.

¹¹² Löwy and Marks, *A Memoir*, 90. Goldsmid referred specifically to incidences of Jewish landlords who 'are quite as anxious as other landlords are' to establish houses of worship for their Christian tenants.

a Jew arguing in favour of increased Christianization the community certainly appreciated such actions. In 1865 the *JC* congratulated Jewish MPs on their behaviour, which had shown fears for Christianity to be groundless and their inclusion justified.¹¹³ All this tended to make Jewish MPs hesitant to tackle ecclesiastical politics. On such matters they were expected to act merely as delegates for their constituents, offering no personal opinion.¹¹⁴

Naturally, this was impossible. As a religious minority, Jews would be affected by decisions concerning English Christianity and, consequently, legislating from this perspective held distinct positions on these questions. The issue that provoked Jewish opinion most was disestablishment, the ultimate goal of nonconformity's drive for complete religious equality and a perpetual Commons topic, courtesy of Edward Miall's exertions. Historically, Anglo-Jewry had supported a strong Established Church, appreciating that its moderate, latitudinarian nature and notable philosemitic streak could be credited with aiding their acceptance in English society. They continued to support the Church throughout this era. Although they seldom voted on such measures, Jewish MPs often vocally defended the Church when campaigning. The Liberal Jacoby reassured his audience in 1885 that 'there was no intention to touch a stick or stone of the Church's property'.¹¹⁵ Jewish Tories, backed by their party line, were more enthusiastic and openly endorsed Establishment. In the same year, Lionel Cohen begged his audience 'to remember that if you adopt this principle of disestablishment, you are in danger of undermining religious feeling and the religious education of children'.¹¹⁶

For some in the community such championing of the Church by a Jew was beyond the pale. 'Of all the shams which Conservative Jews propound this is the most hollow and insincere,' proclaimed Montagu.¹¹⁷ The *JW* moaned that not even Lord Salisbury 'has more warmly championed the state-subsventioned Christian Church' than have some Jews.¹¹⁸ Both Montagu and the paper were puzzled by the stance of some Jewish MPs: 'To the Jew, as to every nonconformist, the very name of an Established Church has an evil sound'; should not Jews, as advocates of religious liberty, be 'necessarily hostile' to it?¹¹⁹ This appeal, however, was out of touch with the post-emancipation

¹¹³ *JC*, 28 July 1865, 4.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.* 27 Nov. 1885, 9.

¹¹⁵ *Derby Daily Telegraph*, 12 Nov. 1885, 4.

¹¹⁶ *JC*, 30 Oct. 1885, 8.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.* 6 Nov. 1885, 7.

¹¹⁸ *JW*, 27 Nov. 1885, 5.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*

drift of Anglo-Jewish identity. Most Jews had perceived emancipation as a finality, unlike their dissenting comrades, who treated it as one step towards total religious equalization in Britain.¹²⁰ After their inclusion, Jews had little taste for promoting spiritual progress and equality; they did not share dissenters' desire for a free competition of religions liberated from state control.¹²¹ Such 'abstract principles' did not excite them. Analysing the situation from their own perspective Jews concluded that, in terms of practical toleration, they had nothing to gain from disestablishment.¹²² The *JC* candidly admitted as much in 1872: 'Jews, as Jews, can have no interest in advocating the dissolution of Church and State, for under the mild rule of the Anglican Communion they enjoy greater freedom than they could possibly expect under the petty tyranny of conflicting schismatics.'¹²³

Post-emancipation, Anglo-Jewry was moving away from the non-conformist model. Disestablishment was only one of several issues that highlighted a growing difference between nonconformist and Jewish politics. The Jewish community had, in many ways, been only default dissenters. Naturally excluded because of its minority and non-Christian nature, Jewry logically identified itself with the cause of religious equality in order to end its exclusion. Once emancipation had granted equality of treatment and recognition to their faith, many Jews were happy for Christians to maintain their religious peculiarities and advantages, including in the political sphere. Jews aspired to join rather than challenge the existing order; their connection to dissent had been more situational than ideational.

In the immediate post-emancipation decades this trend should not be exaggerated. The distancing was gradual, and on many political issues of the period Jewry and dissent still occupied the same position, as they did over the 1871 abolition of University Tests. Anglo-Jewry, with little university experience, was initially little activated by this question, which is surprising because it represented the effective completion of their emancipation. Relative indifference gave way across 1868–9 to eager support, as the *JC* launched a belated propaganda campaign in favour, protest meetings were organized, and the Deputies distributed petitions to all British congregations.¹²⁴ The

¹²⁰ Feldman, *Englishmen*, 120.

¹²¹ J. Parry, *Democracy and Religion: Gladstone and the Liberal Party, 1867–1875* (Cambridge, 1986), 46, 451.

¹²² *JC*, 16 Mar. 1877, 9.

¹²³ *Ibid.* 20 Sept. 1872, 344.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.* 10 July 1868, 4, and *The Times*, 23 May 1870, 7.

catalyst for this transformation was the unprecedented achievement of Jewish students at Cambridge:

That within the last few years persons professing the Jewish religion have respectively attained the rank of Senior, Second and Fifth Wrangler, and that they have all been deprived of their chances of obtaining Fellowships by reason alone of their conscientious objection to subscribe to the liturgy of the Church of England.¹²⁵

The Tests had become a tangible indignity to the community rather than a theoretical injustice and Jewry's enthusiasm for abrogation had altered accordingly.

By this time, though, repeal had been a staple of nonconformity's legislative aspirations for years and prominent Liberals had long advocated it in the House, where a favourable majority had been obtained as early as 1867.¹²⁶ This of itself does not suggest any great dissimilarity with nonconformity; both were going in the same direction, albeit at different speeds. Jewish Members, however, decisively reaffirmed their association with dissenters and their core political principle of religious equality in a vexed vote over an amendment to the Bill, introduced by the Liberal Henry Fawcett, which was designed to remove the exclusivity of clerical fellowships. This highly controversial amendment, which sought to make fellowships in Christian theology attainable by all denominations rather than being restricted to Anglicans, sharply divided opinion in the House. The overwhelming majority of nonconformists were favourable and *The Times* was similarly disposed: 'It is evident that the removal of this restriction is the logical and necessary accompaniment to the Bill, and that without it the reform must necessarily be incomplete.'¹²⁷ Gladstone and the government were opposed, being desirous of sending the Lords exactly the same Bill they had rejected in 1870 in the belief that this would ease its passage. The measure was rejected by the narrowest of margins: 'the Government had to encounter a Division which was little better than a defeat, for it obtained a narrow majority of 22 over its own supporters by the help of the Conservatives.'¹²⁸ Five of the six Jewish MPs who voted defied the

¹²⁵ *JC*, 20 May 1870, 10. The success of Numa Hartog, who became Senior Wrangler in 1869, was particularly responsible for this enthusiasm.

¹²⁶ I. Finstein, 'Anglo-Jewish Attitudes to Jewish Day-School Education, 1850–1950', in idem, *Scenes and Personalities in Anglo-Jewry, 1800–2000* (London, 2002), 120–1.

¹²⁷ *The Times*, 21 Feb. 1871, 7.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.* 7.

party line.¹²⁹ Solidly backing religious liberty, they demonstrated their continuing empathy with dissent. As Simon chided Gladstone: ‘He gave full credit to the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government for his desire to give effect to the claims of the Nonconformists; but the Government were mistaken in the course they had adopted.’¹³⁰

In domestic politics Jewish MPs supported measures of both equality and particularity. They did so independently and in opposition, at one point or another, to many of the various power groupings within the Liberal party. A distinctive Jewish political standpoint was emerging and it pursued a compromise agenda. Unable, it would seem, to position itself within existing political definitions, Anglo-Jewry was attempting to carve out its own niche. This development was most succinctly demonstrated by the community’s reaction to and the MPs’ reception of the 1870 Elementary Education Act. This, unlike University Tests abrogation, was a measure in which Jewry had long been interested. Celebrating the historic connection between Jews and learning, the *JC* opened its list of recommendations in an 1868 leader entitled ‘A Programme for the New Ministry’ with: ‘Before all things, we look for some comprehensive measure for the promotion of education.’¹³¹ The *JC* had lobbied hard in favour of religious education—deriding the secularist camp as both misguided and a specific danger to their minority faith—while being careful to protest the need for protection of Jewish specificity. It was a strongly partisan position:

the position of the Jew utterly differs from that of every Christian denomination in educational matters. . . . What have the Jews in common with a Nonconformist? The Nonconformist system of theology does not broadly differ from the Anglican system. But the Jewish system of theology differs widely from every Christian system.¹³²

Such fears of educational assimilation were alleviated by the Act’s ‘conscience clauses’, which had been carefully monitored by the Board of Deputies in tandem with Jewish MPs.¹³³ Simon even negotiated his

¹²⁹ Hansard, 20 Feb. 1871, cciv, cols. 511–12. Francis Goldsmid was the exception and his reasons were technical rather than idealistic: ‘he was convinced that the success of the amendment would be fatal to the Bill, he thought that, though abstractedly favourable to the amendment, he was acting quite consistently . . . in voting against it.’ Jessel and Mayer de Rothschild did not vote.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, col. 511.

¹³¹ *JC*, 18 Dec. 1868, 4.

¹³² *Ibid.* 15 Apr. 1870, 7.

¹³³ Fineststein, ‘Attitudes’, 60–1. These clauses were specifically included in the Bill during committee in order to safeguard religious liberty. The most significant sections were 14 (2), which prohibited any form of denominational teaching, and 7 (2), which

own amendment through committee, guaranteeing that the Act would not 'require any child to attend school on any day or occasion set apart for religious observance by the religious body to which his parent belongs'.¹³⁴ Once such conditions were in place Jews were happy with a law that instituted the nationwide education for which they had been agitating. Opening a school in Aylesbury some years later, Nathaniel de Rothschild was fulsome in his evaluation, praising it as 'one of the greatest measures which had ever been passed by any government'.¹³⁵

The majority of nonconformists were less enraptured. Severely exercised by aspects of the Act they believed infringed religious equality, notably its provision of increased funding for denominational schools and Clause 25, which permitted poor children to attend Church schools at ratepayers' expense, they agitated to redress these throughout the 1870s. Jews were not similarly motivated. The Act's balance between general application and particular reservations perfectly suited their needs as a minority, providing increased revenue for Jewish schools but also safeguarding their ability to attend board schools, thus furthering social integration but without endangering their consciences. Clause 25 did elicit some activity. Several Jewish MPs pledged to support its revision in order to pacify their dissenting constituents. F. Goldsmid made this a central point of his 1874 election address in Reading:

Of the many valuable laws passed by the present Parliament, we believe that none will be attended with more beneficent results than the Education Act. We are sensible, however, of the strong objection which nonconformists entertain to the 25th clause . . . and we think that the time has arrived when the legislature should repeal this clause, and thus remove the main impediment of the harmonious working of the measure.¹³⁶

Others were prominent in upholding the provision. Isaac, who believed his return for Nottingham was due largely to advocacy of the clause, orchestrated an impassioned opposition to the 1874 Elementary Education Act Amendment Bill, which sought to remove the 25th clause from the original statute: 'I can perceive that a blow at the 25th clause would be a national calamity.'¹³⁷ His amendment that the Bill's second reading be put off three months was carried. Both of

allowed children to be withdrawn on conscientious grounds from even this, which was especially useful to Jews as instruction was still Christian based.

¹³⁴ Hansard, 11 July 1870, cciii, col. 59.

¹³⁵ *The Times*, 17 Jan. 1873, 7.

¹³⁶ *Reading Mercury*, 31 Jan. 1874, 3.

¹³⁷ Hansard, 10 June 1874, ccxix, col. 1320.

these politicians were principally fighting battles for their constituents, however. Anglo-Jewry, despite the occasional grumbling from the *JC* about a 'violation of conscience', was on the whole not bothered by Clause 25.¹³⁸ Given the community's overall satisfaction with the Act, they were, unlike nonconformists, willing to overlook such minor infringements of principle.

IV

On controversial issues of legislation that had no direct impact upon the community, Jewish MPs seemed to have maintained a certain reserve and been largely inactive. When circumstances pressed for decisions these tended to be made with reference to party allegiance. This pattern of behaviour was employed in regard to measures of electoral reform. Few spoke upon these over the period, those that did often restricting their comments to matters of legal technicality. There was, perhaps, a sense that Jewish politicians were not yet experienced enough to participate or that on such contentious topics it was best to practise a dignified silence. It is also likely that few were terribly excited by them. Salomons and Francis Goldsmid made several brief gestures of support in the early 1860s, asserting that a suffrage increase was fair, 'founded as it would be upon the increased education and intelligence of the working classes'.¹³⁹ Lionel de Rothschild, according to Sir Robert Lowe, inclined more towards opposition but not strongly enough to prevent him supporting revision; 'I have no doubt that you do not want a Reform Bill at all and that you think that a change in the direction proposed will not benefit the country, and yet I fully expect to see you voting for it.'¹⁴⁰ Montagu, in the 1880s, was a known supporter of manhood suffrage.¹⁴¹ Aside from these examples no Jewish MP took a particular interest in electoral reform. Most were, though, like Rothschild, prepared to vote for it, and at times their support was crucial in furthering change. The second reading of the Representation of the People Bill, April 1866, passed by a majority of five, and all six Jewish members had voted in favour.¹⁴² This did not necessarily represent blanket Jewish support for

¹³⁸ *JC*, 25 Aug. 1876, 328.

¹³⁹ Hansard, 8 May 1865, clxxviii, col. 1660.

¹⁴⁰ Rothschild Archive, London, 000/848, Papers of Lionel de Rothschild, Letter to Lionel from Sir Robert Lowe, 3 Feb. 1866.

¹⁴¹ *Who's Who*, ii. 253.

¹⁴² Hansard, 27 Apr. 1866, clxxxiii, cols. 152–6.

democratic ideals but seems to have been largely a consequence of their party politics. Francis Goldsmid was highly critical of the 1867 Reform Act and its Tory progenitors.¹⁴³ De Worms voted against the second reading of the 1884 Reform Act, whilst three Liberal Jewish members supported it.¹⁴⁴

The increasing democratization of the period occasioned an immense change in British politics, and Jewish MPs were, in spite of their official inertia, unavoidably involved in this as politicians. A well-established conception of the political nation was being overhauled as participation became popularized, the importance of public rhetoric grew, and the notion of governments requiring a popular mandate developed.¹⁴⁵ British politicians reacted differently as the system altered around them. Gladstone and an increasingly radical section of the Liberal party embraced the new situation; others preferred to retain older theories of government as being independent of public pressure, disinterestedly ruling for the common good; many unconsciously adopted a mixture of the two. Jewish members displayed similar behaviour, exhibiting a range of conceptions depending upon their English values and Jewish experiences. Discussion was largely intra-Liberal, though; Tory Jews do not seem to have commented much, partly, no doubt, as Conservative politicians had less of a need to adopt imaginative electioneering concepts, which risked alienating their traditional supporters, for whom orthodox methods were perfectly adequate.¹⁴⁶ De Worms did adopt the innovative tactic at Greenwich of printing a pamphlet containing three of his election speeches and forwarding a copy to every elector in the borough. But he coupled this with denunciations of Gladstone as an 'irresponsible demagogue', employing 'flowers of rhetoric' in contrast to solid Conservative action.¹⁴⁷

Many of the original Jewish MPs held what might be termed Whiggish attitudes concerning the political order. Believing government responsible for improving the people they thought it crucial that any

¹⁴³ Ibid. 25 Mar. 1867, clxxxvi, col. 525.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid. 7 Nov. 1884, ccxciii, cols. 1328–32.

¹⁴⁵ M. Bentley, *Politics without Democracy 1815–1914: Perception and Preoccupation in British Governments*, 2nd edn. (Oxford, 1996), 137–9.

¹⁴⁶ H. Hanham, *Elections and Party Management: Politics in the Time of Disraeli and Gladstone* (London, 1959), 207–8.

¹⁴⁷ *Home and Foreign Policy of the Conservative Government: Three Speeches Delivered by Baron Henry de Worms to the Electors of Greenwich* (London, 1880), 52, 65.

reform not lead to 'the property and intelligence of the constituencies being swamped by the humbler voters now being admitted'.¹⁴⁸ Desire to maintain political power and avoid dissent in a more democratic state were seen as the necessary guarantees that ensured the upper classes fulfilled their obligations. It was a somewhat paternalist approach to ruling, the classic Jewish exponents of which were the Rothschilds. With their lack of interest in parliamentary activity, preference for behind-the-scenes decisions, but concern for the people's welfare, if not opinions, the family clearly possessed quite a traditional idea of governing. Lionel once even advised Disraeli to ignore public opinion, which he characterized as volatile and fickle.¹⁴⁹ Mayer, as did many of the 'Whig Jews', repeatedly trumpeted the impartiality of his candidacy:

I need scarcely say that my position renders me totally independent of any Government; and that while I am not insensible to the proper ties of party, I have been guided in my political conduct solely by considerations of the public interest, without fear of, or favour to, any administration.¹⁵⁰

The family were not ignorant, however, of their representative responsibilities and seemed to appreciate their constituents' opinions. Mayer invested considerable effort in cultivating these, as he described to his brothers:

I am obliged to go around & see nearly all the voters as I was told an old farmer who till now was Liberal & commands some votes, was on the point of turning because I had not yet called upon him. I still find myself the popular candidate, especially among the sailors & fishermen, with the latter in consequence of my speech.¹⁵¹

Rothschild perceptions adapted slightly as time progressed and the British context absorbed more democratic notions. Ferdinand was by 1885 describing the 'force of popular opinion' as a positive input.¹⁵²

¹⁴⁸ Hansard, 13 Apr. 1866, clxxxii, cols. 1277–8. The quote was Francis Goldsmid's.

¹⁴⁹ Bodleian Library, Hughendon Papers, 141/3, Letter from Lionel to Disraeli, 8 Sept. 1876 and 14 Sept. 1876.

¹⁵⁰ Rothschild Archive, London, 000/235, Report of Mayer's Hythe election address, n.d. (c.1868).

¹⁵¹ Rothschild Archive, London, XI/109/95, Sundry Private Correspondence, Letter from Mayer to his brothers and nephews, 22 Oct. 1868.

¹⁵² British Library, Add. MS 58791, fo. 18, Papers of T. H. S. Escott, Letter from Ferdinand to Escott, 1885.

They remained essentially Whig, though, as Ferdinand reveals in a letter of censure to Dilke:

I consider it unworthy of . . . yourself to court popularity with the masses by advocating such . . . measures as the abolition of the game laws for instance and stimulating an unhealthy desire for social and pecuniary equality the . . . results of which have been only too well illustrated in France, instead of governing the people on broad principles and leading them with wider issues.¹⁵³

Not all Liberal Jewish MPs were so hostile to the new, popular style of politics. Simon was an early adherent; his political idea invested the people with responsibility: 'when they had a representative government and a system by which their public policy was regulated upon true and representative questions, then it was the nation which was to blame if their representatives went wrong.'¹⁵⁴ In Simon's vision popular opinion was to inform politicians' actions. It was a very Gladstonian conception that was shared by several other Jews inhabiting the radical side of British politics. Jacoby premised his support for Home Rule on Irish desires: 'democracy should say that justice and equal rights with their fellow subjects should be granted to Ireland.'¹⁵⁵ Montagu, who almost hero-worshipped Gladstone, insisted that Britain be completely democratized to promote social reform.¹⁵⁶ All these MPs had entered Parliament after the second Reform Act and were generally of a lower socio-economic status than many of the Jewish Whigs. This, alongside their radicalism, probably accounts for their more democratic understanding of the British political system. But Jewish experience, it seems, did exercise at least a small, complementary part in this. Simon and Jacoby were not members of the Cousinhood and, whilst they participated in communal politics, they were never able to attain the highest offices. The quasi-oligarchic Anglo-Jewish system was highly restrictive: directed by a plutocratic elite, it was not very receptive to opinion, despite a growing restlessness for more representation at the grass roots.¹⁵⁷ The potentially frustrating experience of operating within this establishment probably inclined these MPs further toward democratic ideals. Montagu, too, despite being a member of the elite, was exasperated with the narrowness

¹⁵³ British Library, Add. MS 43919, fo. 89, Papers of Sir Charles Wentworth Dilke, Letter from Ferdinand to Dilke, 1885.

¹⁵⁴ *The Times*, 18 Oct. 1871, 6.

¹⁵⁵ *Derby Daily Telegraph*, 23 June 1886, 3.

¹⁵⁶ Montagu, *Samuel Montagu*, 68, and Gutwein, *Divided Elite*, 143.

¹⁵⁷ I. Finestein, 'Arthur Cohen QC, 1829–1914', in *idem*, *Jewish Society*, 315.

of communal institutions. A *novus homo*, he found it harder to gain influence or implement reform and was eventually forced to create a new institution to facilitate his desire of providing immigrant Jews with communal representation.¹⁵⁸ In contrast, many of the Whiggish MPs, Salomons, the Rothschilds, the Goldsmids, were stalwarts of the governing Cousinhood and had, with their extended families, been running the community on a basis of *noblesse oblige* for decades. This approach echoed in their national politics.

The overwhelming majority of Jewish politicians associated themselves with the Liberal party. Of the eighteen MPs, only four sat for the Conservatives, and the presence of these in Parliament was heavily weighted toward the end of the period. Saul Isaac was the first in 1874, ending sixteen years of solely Liberal Jewish representation. Isaac lost his seat in 1880 and de Worms replaced him as the sole representative of Jewish Conservatism. Not until 1885, almost three decades after a Jew first sat in the Commons, did the number of Jewish Tories rise beyond one, de Worms being joined by L. Cohen and Isaacs. Jewish MPs' political allegiance was dominated by adherence to the Liberals. This was not surprising. The Liberal party was both more electorally successful during this era and more representative of interest groups containing Jews, such as nonconformist religion and non-landed money. Jews' interests could be identified with Liberal interests and it was rational for the majority to support the party. This Jewish attachment, however, was more complex than logical interest identification. For some it was also, in part, based upon a deeply emotional and peculiarly Jewish reasoning. As the *JC* explained:

Liberalism is not forced upon them from without . . . This Liberalism springs from within. It is not only a product of a feeling of gratitude for the triumph which the Liberal party has achieved for the Jewish cause, but also the firm conviction that it is the vital principle upon which rests the Revelation of Sinai and the indispensable condition of all progress.¹⁵⁹

There was a belief, particularly among the more radical members, in the essential mutuality of Jewish and Liberal ideals, that the creeds were two sides of the same coin. Montagu, for instance, always justified his politics with reference to biblical authority.¹⁶⁰ For these Jews, being Jewish gave them a special relationship to the Liberal party; the most

¹⁵⁸ Gutwein, *Divided Elite*, 125.

¹⁵⁹ *JC*, 15 Feb. 1867, 4.

¹⁶⁰ Montagu, *Samuel Montagu*, 79.

obvious manifestation of which was the community's conception of political gratitude.

The issue of emancipation had in reality blurred and transcended formal political lines, but 'at the time it was fashionable to see it as a clash . . . between the forces of reaction embodied in the Tory party and the forces of Enlightenment represented by the Radicals, Whigs and Liberals'.¹⁶¹ This simplification entered into popular Jewish conscience. Aggrieved by what it perceived as bigoted Tory opposition, the community was genuinely appreciative of Liberal efforts for its freedom and felt indebted to the party. Supporting the Liberals in these circumstances became a reciprocal Jewish duty. An 1865 *JC* correspondent was 'truly sorry' to have discovered members of Northampton Jewry voting Tory. 'It is true that every elector has a just right to record his votes as he thinks best; but I feel no Jew ought to be so impolitic, nay, so ungrateful.'¹⁶² This almost quid pro quo understanding of their political affiliation bound Jews to the Liberal party in an obligatory relationship. These 'obligations' continued to be touted by some Jewish MPs throughout the period—in 1885, nearly three decades after emancipation, Montagu was still lamenting Conservative Jews' endeavours to 'divert the gratitude of the Jews from the great party which has given them religious liberty'.¹⁶³ So convinced was Montagu of Liberal–Jewish affinity that he sought, with Jewish Toryism in the capital on the increase, to modernize the age-worn commitment, rather tendentiously globalizing its application and implications: 'however much his friends might forget the services rendered to them by the Liberal party in this country', he lectured a meeting in Christ-Church school, Spitalfields,

they must not forget what the Liberal party was doing for the Jews in Germany, Russia, Poland and Romania . . . against the Conservative element, which was opposing them. It would be, he thought, little less than a disgrace for it to go forth to all the world that in Whitechapel, where the Jewish vote was the strongest, the Jews had handed over their allegiance from the Liberal to the Conservative party. Sufficient reason would then be given for Prince Bismarck and Ignatieff to ask the Liberal leaders of what use it was to defend the Jewish people, who, as soon as they received emancipation . . . left the Liberal party in the lurch.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶¹ Alderman, *Jewish Community*, 17.

¹⁶² *JC*, 11 Aug. 1865, 5.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.* 6 Nov. 1885, 7.

¹⁶⁴ University of Southampton Library, MS 117, Papers of Lord Swaythling, Scrapbook of Press Cuttings, 105.

Montagu's efforts were increasingly in vain. The 1886 general election witnessed, for the first time, the virtually even spread of Jewish MPs across the political spectrum. A delighted *JC* welcomed this indication of acculturation: 'the Anglo-Jewish community, judged by its representatives may be fairly designated the microcosm of English political opinion.'¹⁶⁵ There had been a fundamental shift in Jewish political allegiance; the 'umbilical cord' binding the community to Liberalism had been cut and it was now 'eminently respectable' to be a Conservative Jew.¹⁶⁶ What had occasioned this change? The community's newspapers had been preaching the necessity of political neutrality since the late 1860s. In contrast to its earlier rhetoric the *JC* began repeatedly asserting Jewish independence at election times: 'every Jew should conscientiously follow his own convictions in the matter, and protest stoutly against every attempt to identify Judaism with any political party.'¹⁶⁷ The *JW* was also eager to demonstrate this. It pointed out in 1885, for instance, that in two constituencies rival Jewish candidates opposed each other.¹⁶⁸ The idea (and ideal) of projecting this official image of neutrality, despite the reality of a peculiar inclination towards Liberalism, was to 'sink the Jew in the Englishmen', which, as Simon—one of the more bullish Liberals—wrote to *The Times*, would serve as a 'striking example of the aptitude of Jews for assimilation with the nations'.¹⁶⁹ It reflected a desire, perhaps as the novelty of participation waned and issues concerning their inclusion were forgotten, to demonstrate that Jews were politically indistinguishable from other Englishmen. Alderman distinguishes this assimilative urge as the essential cause of the transformation, claiming that Jews' distancing from Liberalism 'was a conscious and deliberate act, and was seen by them as a necessary demonstration of political maturity and . . . of social integration and acceptance'.¹⁷⁰ In

¹⁶⁵ *JC*, 23 July 1886, 9. The breakdown the *JC* offered was: two Tory; three Liberal; and two Unionist. There were in fact nine Jews elected in 1886, not seven. The *JC*'s oversight was probably a result of reporting before the conclusion of the election process. The final political spread of Jewish MPs was: three Conservative; four Liberal; and two Unionist.

¹⁶⁶ Alderman, *Jewish Community*, 41–2.

¹⁶⁷ *JC*, 4 Dec. 1868, 4; 20 Nov. 1868, 5. This shift in the *JC*'s position was occasioned by a change of ownership; the paper was purchased by several communal notables who replaced the Bohemian-born and quite outspokenly Jewish editor Abraham Benisch with the English and more acculturated Michael Henry.

¹⁶⁸ *JW*, 20 Nov. 1885, 6. These were Whitechapel where Montagu faced Alderman Cowan (Tory) and Tower Hamlets where Isaacs competed against A. Henriques (Liberal).

¹⁶⁹ *JC*, 4 Dec. 1885, 4, and *The Times*, 22 Oct. 1879, 8.

¹⁷⁰ Alderman, *Jewish Community*, 42.

other words, the move toward a variegated communal politicization was deliberately undertaken in a desire to be more English. This seems unlikely. The action was certainly a conscious one and considerations of acculturation were important, but it would appear that the fundamental factors were derived from Jewish reasoning.

Most influential was the Bulgarian Agitation of 1876 and subsequent Eastern Question of 1877–8.¹⁷¹ An episode that deeply divided Britain, the crisis was sparked by Turkish massacres of Bulgarian Christians during the 1875–6 pacification of their rebellious Balkan territories. When reports of these reached Britain outrage erupted and Gladstone returned from retirement to lead a nationwide agitation, intent on dismantling the Ottoman Empire and liberating the Eastern Christians.¹⁷² The Jewish community did not share this perspective, preferring the government's policy of upholding Porte rule to counter Russian influence in the region. Piqued at this, many Liberals, including Gladstone—never a great friend of Jewry—associated themselves with anti-Jewish criticism and questioned the community's Englishness. This deeply wounded Jewry. The *JC*, 'in the face of these persistent attacks', reprimanded the Liberals for appealing to the 'bigotry' of England in a movement of 'extravagances'.¹⁷³ 'Mr. Gladstone is undoubtedly, free from all these reproaches. But the party which under the shield of his great name fumes, frets, and spouts . . . cannot be absolved from this grave censure.'¹⁷⁴ The *Daily Telegraph*, owned by the Jewish Levy-Lawson family, switched its allegiance to the Tory party.¹⁷⁵ Even the most devout of Liberal Jewish MPs felt compelled to protest: 'Mr. Gladstone's high-mindedness and generous nature we all know; but . . . he has been grievously misinformed and misled with regard to the Jews as a body upon the Eastern question.' 'Never', admitted Simon, 'was the temptation to throw aside the ties of party greater.'¹⁷⁶

¹⁷¹ Although discussed again later in this chapter, this work will not examine details of the Agitation and subsequent Eastern Question, which have been covered extensively by other works; see, in particular, chapter 4 of Feldman, *Englishmen*; R. Shannon, *Gladstone and the Bulgarian Agitation, 1876*, 2nd edn. (Hassocks, 1976); R. Seton-Watson, *Disraeli, Gladstone and the Eastern Question: A Study in Diplomacy and Party Politics* (London, 1971); and R. Millman, *Britain and the Eastern Question, 1875–1878* (Oxford, 1979).

¹⁷² Feldman, *Englishmen*, 97–8.

¹⁷³ *JC*, 5 Oct. 1877, 9.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.* 20 Oct. 1876, 451.

¹⁷⁵ Alderman, *Modern British Jewry*, 99.

¹⁷⁶ *The Times*, 18 Oct. 1879, 8. The quote is taken from a letter Simon wrote to *The Times* in an attempt to heal the breach between Jewry and the Liberals; a task he devoted himself to for the rest of his political career. Simon was one of the few Jewish MPs to

A longer-term concern, though, was the developmental dynamic within sections of Liberal opinion of which the agitation was symptomatic and which Jews, as Jews, found alienating. After the 1867 Reform Act, Liberal politics shifted to encompass a more populist base. An enlarged nonconformist presence pushed for a remoralization of politics and the party agenda was increasingly aimed at addressing long-term issues of social and religious inequality. This resulted, as mentioned, in measures that were, at best, ambivalent towards Jewish interests and that provoked the community and its MPs to assert Jewish exceptionalism. This did not endear Liberal interventionism to the community. 'We do not believe in too much government of any sort; that country is the most free and the most happy which is the least governed,' moaned the *JC* in 1870.¹⁷⁷ Increasingly alienated from nonconformist opinion and fearing the blurring of differences this trend entailed, many Jews began to doubt 'whether the Liberal party of the day is really the heir of the Whigs of the past'.¹⁷⁸ Anglo-Jewry was far from alone in this opinion and, though vocalized through a specifically Jewish argumentation, the community's distancing from the Liberal party echoed and was informed by the general English trend of the period. This witnessed a shift in the allegiance of the propertied middle classes, for a variety of reasons—disillusionment with the Liberals in power, the unsettling growth of a mass democratic system, increasing Liberal radicalism, and several perceived threats to property—from Liberalism to Conservatism.¹⁷⁹

This realignment was not only a product of Liberal alienation but derived also from a growing regard for Tory politics. Aside from pursuing what was construed as a 'pro-Jewish' line during the Eastern Question, Conservatism had been refashioned over the 1870s and imbued by Disraeli with a popular appeal. Most famously in speeches at Manchester and Crystal Palace in 1872, Disraeli located nationalist sentiment in Britain's ancient institutions, promoted the need for social reform and lauded the country's imperial achievements, investing Conservatism with an appeal that was both national and inclusive.¹⁸⁰ The *JC* was

stick with Gladstone throughout the Eastern episode; that he admitted the Liberal leader was at fault was telling indeed.

¹⁷⁷ *JC*, 18 Mar. 1870, 8.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.* 27 Nov. 1885, 9.

¹⁷⁹ P. Smith, *Disraelian Conservatism and Social Reform* (London, 1967), 323–4.

¹⁸⁰ T. Kebbel (ed.), *Selected Speeches of the Late Right Hon. the Earl of Beaconsfield*, 2 vols. (London, 1882), ii. 506, 524–8 and G. Buckle, *The Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield*, 6 vols. (London, 1920), v. 187–95.

impressed: 'The Conservative Government, although circumstances did not permit it fully to carry them out, had beneficial schemes and bright promise for the benefit of our race.'¹⁸¹

Disraeli himself was notable for first stimulating Jewish interest in the Tories, as is illustrated well by the development of his relationship with the Rothschild MPs. Despite advising Lionel upon the Jewish Relief Bills, Disraeli was initially viewed with some suspicion by the family; 'I am not sorry that Dizzy has made mistakes, it is the natural consequence of hypocrisy; and no party can hope to present a bold front to the enemy which does not represent some principle,' Nathaniel wrote his parents from Cambridge.¹⁸² As Disraeli proved his political and social ability, though, so the Rothschilds warmed to the upstart. He became a regular and popular guest at their houses, charming all members of the family; 'You can have no idea how delightfully agreeable Mr. Disraeli was yesterday; we listened to him with intense admiration. . . It was a great treat to hear him, and even Mrs. Disraeli's presence was unable to mar the pleasure.'¹⁸³ The proclivities of Lionel and Nathaniel tended increasingly toward Disraelian rather than Gladstonian politics as the period progressed, a shift reflecting not merely practicalities but a genuine fondness: 'You know my dear Lord Beaconsfield the great affection my brothers and myself have always entertained for you.'¹⁸⁴ Disraeli's protection of Jewish interests during the Bulgarian Crisis cemented this closeness. Particularly notable was the instrumental role he played in securing a Jewish equal rights clause in the Treaty of Berlin—which effectively ended the Eastern Crisis in July 1878—following Lionel's written request: 'May I. . . be allowed to ask your Lordship, that while Her Majesty's representatives advocate religious equality, they may also endeavour to remove those disabilities. . . under which the Jews in Romania and Servia [*sic*] are suffering.'¹⁸⁵ In the years after this event, Nathaniel was to refer to

¹⁸¹ *JC*, 30 Apr. 1880, 9.

¹⁸² Rothschild Archives, London, Rothschild Family Correspondence, RFam C/3/90, Letter from Nathaniel to his parents, n.d., and RFam C/4/54, Letter from Lionel to Charlotte, July 1858. See also 000/848, Papers of Lionel de Rothschild, Letter from Disraeli to Lionel, 26 Dec. 1847.

¹⁸³ Rothschild Archives, London, Rothschild Family Correspondence, 000/84, Letter from Charlotte to Leopold, 29 Jan. 1866.

¹⁸⁴ Bodleian Library, Hughenden Papers, 141/3, fos. 106–43, Letter from Nathaniel to Disraeli, 30 Dec. 1879.

¹⁸⁵ *JC*, 14 June 1878, 10, and N. Ferguson, *The House of Rothschild*, ii: *The World's Banker, 1849–1998* (London, 2000), 306. The Rothschilds' pro-Turkish stance in the

Disraeli, with only the slightest sense of flattery, as 'the greatest of British statesmen'.¹⁸⁶

Anglo-Jewry's reaction to Disraeli echoed in large part this Rothschild experience. Impressed by his intimacy with their premier family, gratified by his glorification of the Jewish race, and appreciative of his championing of Jewish interests, Anglo-Jewry claimed Disraeli as one of their own: 'Benjamin Disraeli belongs to the Jewish people, despite his baptismal certificate. His talents, his virtues and shortcomings alike, are purely of the Jewish cast.'¹⁸⁷ Disraeli's appeal to Jewry exceeded the conventionally political. It addressed the very definition of their identity in the post-emancipation world; demonstrating the importance the community still attached to its exceptionality, which it could interpret ethnically, whilst at the same time coveting inclusion as full Englishmen. Disraeli, in both action and example, enabled such duality.

These various Jewish-based considerations, operating in tandem with general trends, broke the Liberal party's monopoly on Jewish affiliation. Jews in the 1880s were able to identify their particular interests with both political parties and Jewishness ceased to be a conclusive factor. The *JC* noted in 1881 that 'most City Jews are Conservative, but we contend that their Judaism has had nothing to do with it'.¹⁸⁸ Reference to English ideals was now essential to determining their allegiance and independent political interests became decisive. Simon and Montagu, for instance, who possessed very different Jewish identities, continued to locate their interests as Jews in the Liberal party because as Englishmen they both held radical views, believing the party to represent liberty and equality. Similarly, L. Cohen and de Worms, Conservatively inclined, appealed to Jews' imperial tendencies and sought to guarantee their interests in stable Tory government.

Eastern Question demonstrates the extent to which their politics were motivated by Jewish concerns and not, as Gutwein suggests, based purely upon economic self-interest. The whole incident was generally hard on banks, and war with Russia would have been ruinous for the Rothschilds' major stake in Russian bonds. See Gutwein, *Divided Elite*, 125–8.

¹⁸⁶ Bodleian Library, Hughenden Papers, 141/3, fos. 106–43, Letter from Nathaniel to Disraeli, 29 Nov. 1880. This assessment starkly contrasts with Nathaniel's contemporaneous evaluation of the Liberal leader, whom he dubbed: 'that arch-fiend Gladstone': see Letter from Nathaniel to Disraeli, 9 Dec. 1879.

¹⁸⁷ *JC*, 18 Aug. 1876, 312. Not all Jews were this enthusiastic about Disraeli. Julian Goldsmid, for one, criticized him as 'the licensed romancer of a prosaic ministry'; see Hansard, 24 Mar. 1879, cxcliv, col. 1519.

¹⁸⁸ *JC*, 19 Aug. 1881, 9.

V

International politics and foreign affairs were obviously important to a community like the Jews, whose associations were historically cosmopolitan and supranational. They could, as evidenced in the last section, have a dramatic impact upon the community's political stance in Britain. Jewish MPs, however, did not often participate in discussion of British foreign policy, though they regarded it as significant. Like most Victorians, English Jews attached great importance to British power in the world.¹⁸⁹ To preserve this they were eager for Britain to possess a strong military capability. Throughout his career Salomons urged the necessity of high taxation in order to maintain the naval establishment on a 'large scale'.¹⁹⁰ Simon, motivated by the need to ensure the country's 'great maritime strength', lobbied in 1871 for England's withdrawal from the Declaration of Paris.¹⁹¹

In these desires Jewish politicians were probably typical of many MPs. Jew and Gentile met on common ground in their self-righteous belief in England's civilizing role in the world.¹⁹² Militarism was justified with reference to Britain's moral advancement and its duty to disseminate progress. As Simon explained: 'British interests meant the interests of humanity; and, England claiming to be at the head of civilization, was bound in duty to herself and to the cause of civilization to maintain her power . . . for the interests of mankind.'¹⁹³ Parallel to this support for English advancement, Jewish MPs denounced instances of foreign tyranny and persecution. Besides the activity regarding Jewish prejudice detailed below, the MPs protested a number of causes in the House, such as the 1863 Russian repression of Poland and the unsatisfactory situation of 'semi-despotic' Prussian oppression in the Schleswig-Holstein duchies.¹⁹⁴ In promoting English power and deprecating less civilized nations, Jewish MPs were not bullish. Whenever possible they advocated non-intervention in foreign states; Britain's military was to be a deterrent only. In the event of a major war, like the American Civil War or Franco-Prussian conflict, most supported a position of neutrality

¹⁸⁹ Finestein, 'Post-Emancipation Jewry', 168–9.

¹⁹⁰ *The Times*, 24 Oct. 1861, 7.

¹⁹¹ Hansard, 21 Apr. 1871, ccv, cols. 1479–82.

¹⁹² Finestein, 'Post-Emancipation Jewry', 169.

¹⁹³ Hansard, 22 Mar. 1878, ccxxxviii, col. 1867.

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.* 20 July 1863, clxxii, col. 1123, and 7 Apr. 1865, clxxviii, cols. 1657–8.

and expressed hopes for a swift end to the conflict, preferably resulting from international mediation.¹⁹⁵ For all their chauvinism Jews were pacific; as Jessel wryly indicated during his 1872 campaign in Dover: ‘At present England could boast that she was at peace with the whole world, which was a good thing for England to be able to say, as it very seldom happened.’¹⁹⁶

The rise of a popular and articulate policy of Empire during the 1870s–1880s was to challenge this Jewish approach to foreign policy. Posing a quandary for all Liberal politicians, imperialism simultaneously appealed through its ability to extend British influence and, hence, a superior morality, and appalled due to its encouragement of conflict and oppression. Jews’ understanding of Britain’s foreign role was ambivalent to imperialism. Consequently, MPs tended to make decisions based upon party lines and, as a group, split in their opinions. The few Tory Jews were supportive: especially de Worms, who had promoted the greatness of Empire in contrast to the ‘selfish policy’ of non-intervention since his first election. Appealing to the sentiments of his Greenwich constituents he extolled the economic benefits of imperialism:

Free trade or fair trade were nothing as compared to the one great principle which governed every nation, that trade followed the flag. It was not a question of money they spent in taxation to defend the country, but of the money they would have to spend in taxation if they did not defend it.¹⁹⁷

And, unusually for a Jew, he strongly advocated the aggressive use of Britain’s power to maintain its foreign interests: ‘I think the example of Zululand will prove most beneficial, because it will show that the grasp of England extends far beyond her own immediate shores. No matter how distant our colonies maybe, still the strong arm of England will protect them.’¹⁹⁸ Endorsement of Empire came too, though, from some of the more Whiggish members, notably those good friends of Disraeli, the Rothschilds. Nathaniel always maintained his love of peace, but driven by business interests the family had become leading members of the elite of imperial investors, and as such their role in furthering the British Empire was substantial.¹⁹⁹ Ferdinand was more openly enthusiastic; criticizing the lack of support for Empire displayed by his government, ‘who have sacrificed if not the interests yet the magic power

¹⁹⁵ Hansard, 17 Feb. 1871, cciv, col. 414, and *The Times*, 22 Dec. 1864, 6.

¹⁹⁶ *The Times*, 2 Oct. 1872, 12. ¹⁹⁷ *Kentish Mercury*, 12 Dec. 1884, 3.

¹⁹⁸ Home and Foreign Policy of the Conservative Government, 23.

¹⁹⁹ Ferguson, *The House of Rothschild*, 291.

of the English flag and name for the narrower issue of Parliamentary reform', he claimed the Union Jack should 'flutter in every island of Polynesia', 'on every minaret in the East'.²⁰⁰ Those MPs who retained a Liberal outlook were critical, however. Julian Goldsmid excoriated Disraeli's ministry on several occasions for its actions in South Africa and Afghanistan, which he claimed were costly, ruinous, and dubiously legal.²⁰¹ Simon often echoed these efforts and, like Goldsmid, was not beyond censuring his own party if they perpetuated imperial policies, as well. His Liberal conscience was most irritated by the annexation of the Transvaal, where he called upon the government to treat Boers leniently, 'for they had only fought for the liberties which belonged to them by right'.²⁰²

These foreign policy assumptions were to largely inform Jewish MPs' consideration of the technically domestic but often proxy imperial issue of the governance of Ireland.²⁰³ With little direct implication for them as a minority, the MPs played no active role in Irish policy and seemed happy to either support measures calculated to promote peace or abstain entirely. The debate on Home Rule, however, shattered this consensus. Polarizing Parliament, the issue also divided Jewish politicians. Gladstone's characterization of Home Rule as a measure calculated to end coercion and concede the moral right of self-government struck a chord with many Jewish MPs, who had often preached similar sentiments in regard to foreign policy.²⁰⁴ Foremost among them was Simon, who had espoused Home Rule since 1873.²⁰⁵ In his view the present Irish policy, entailing 'the suspension of the liberties of the people', had failed. Was this debacle to continue indefinitely, he questioned? 'Are we to allow our country to play the role of Russia towards Poland?'²⁰⁶ Several other Jews endorsed this moralized perspective: Jacoby termed Home Rule a 'policy of justice'; Montagu portrayed the issue as one of toleration; and

²⁰⁰ British Library, Add. MS 43913, fo. 89, Papers of Sir Charles Wentworth Dilke, Letter from Ferdinand to Dilke, 1885. Ferdinand stressed the metaphorical nature of his comment.

²⁰¹ *The Times*, 24 Oct. 1878, 10; 13 Nov. 1879, 10.

²⁰² Hansard, 21 Jan. 1881, cclvii, col. 1137. For Goldsmid see *The Times*, 13, 14, and 15 Sept. 1882.

²⁰³ The question of Ireland would have been, of course, classed as a domestic issue for contemporaries, the country being an integral part of the Union at this time. Its inclusion in this chapter is therefore something of a concession to the work's thematic organization. Home Rule was, though, the beginning of Ireland's transformation from a 'domestic' issue into a 'foreign' issue within British politics.

²⁰⁴ Parry, *Democracy*, 445–6. ²⁰⁵ *The Times*, 4 Oct. 1873, 5.

²⁰⁶ Hansard, 21 May 1886, cccv, cols. 1700–1.

A. Cohen had been calling for some years for Ireland to be governed in accordance with its wants.²⁰⁷ These men were motivated, seemingly, by their shared radical political outlook; only Montagu utilized Jewish argument in his support.²⁰⁸ The substantial number of Irish voters in many of their constituencies no doubt, though, augmented these convictions. A. Cohen had to overcome Tory opponents in Southwark who lauded their Irish ancestry and printed green-inked posters bearing proclamations such as: 'The past shows that the Conservatives have been truer friends to Ireland than the Liberals, and therefore every Irishman who loves his Church, his children, and his country, should vote for the Conservative candidate.'²⁰⁹

Politics also decided the opposition of Tory Jews. L. Cohen, Isaacs, and de Worms all denounced the 'pernicious' and 'separatist' Home Rule policy, which they believed would be not only ruinous for Ireland but the thin end of the wedge for eventual dissolution of the Empire.²¹⁰ De Worms, the avid imperialist, was the most forthright in condemnation: 'Home Rule was a spurious name for the disintegration of the British Empire, which under no circumstances would he sanction or countenance.'²¹¹ A mixture of these reasons compelled two Jewish MPs to become Unionists. Julian Goldsmid and Ferdinand de Rothschild, relatively moderate Liberals, exhibited an ambivalent attitude toward Ireland. Fearful that Home Rule might hand the loyal minority over to a hostile government and concerned for imperial unity they resisted the proposal, but wishing to avoid oppression, they were prepared to grant a 'fair and reasonable arrangement' for some self-rule.²¹² Such a Unionist compromise was also favoured by the *JW* and Nathaniel (now Lord) de Rothschild. For Nathaniel, opposition to Home Rule, the issue most instrumental in his departure from the

²⁰⁷ For Jacoby see *Derby Daily Telegraph*, 23 June 1886, 1; for Montagu *JC*, 2 July 1886, 9; and for Cohen *The Times*, 13 Dec. 1880, 10.

²⁰⁸ *JC*, 2 July 1886, 9. Montagu reckoned Ireland had peculiar claims upon the gratitude of the Jewish people, for the country was almost the only one in the world not stained by blood-guiltiness towards Jews.

²⁰⁹ Southwark Local History Library, Conservative Election Ephemera, 'To Irishmen of the South Metropolitan Boroughs'; 'Southwark Election. The National Vote'; 'Why I Vote for Mr. Edward Clarke'; and 'Why I Vote for Mr. Andrew Dunn', four posters variously addressed to Irishmen and Catholics, n.d.

²¹⁰ For de Worms see *The Times*, 1 Sept. 1886, 7; for Isaacs *Southwark Standard and South London News*, 19 June 1886, 2–3; and for Cohen *Paddington Times*, 19 June 1886, 5.

²¹¹ *Kentish Mercury*, 27 Mar. 1880, 3.

²¹² Hansard, 3 June 1886, cccvi, col. 933.

Liberals, was predicated largely upon socio-economic factors, notably a concern for property. The City, sharing these concerns, was overwhelmingly Unionist, and this probably influenced Ferdinand and Goldsmid's attitudes.²¹³ There was, then, no united Jewish position upon Home Rule. MPs based their decision upon party politics and to a lesser extent economic opinion. This spread them across the political spectrum, and after 1886 Irish issues would always separate Jewish MPs along party lines.

In their approach to foreign affairs Jewish politicians pursued ideas complementary to both their English and Jewish beliefs and no friction occurred between the two. They followed views essentially indistinguishable from those of their Gentile colleagues. One incident in this period did, however, set these two determinants in opposition: the aforementioned Eastern Question. The majority of Anglo-Jews favoured Disraeli's policy of maintaining Ottoman control over the Balkans and actively opposed Gladstone's agitation for Christian independence in the area. The community had traditionally been pro-Turk. Using a nation's treatment of Jews as a barometer of civilization, Jewish MPs had long found Balkan Christians wanting, claiming they possessed a 'taint of semi-barbarism'.²¹⁴ A similar conclusion was reached in 1876. Portrayed as brutal, lazy, and drunk, Eastern Christians were judged to have always acted against minorities. Jews, noted the *JC*, were better off under Turkish rule and, as a result, the community favoured its continuation.²¹⁵ In doing so they were obviously acting on Jewish instincts, not English ones. Although Disraelian policy might have been defended as part of a long-standing British effort to sustain Turkish dominion against Russian encroachment, Anglo-Jewry evaluated the situation only from the perspective of their Eastern co-religionists.

There is, in the first place, a feeling of gratitude which sways our sympathy for Turkey. . . Things go by comparison, and if we institute a comparison between the woes inflicted on the Jew by Esau, as Christendom was figuratively designated, and those suffered from Ismael, as Mahometanism was called by the rabbis, the latter were found more endurable. . . Witness Eski-Zaghra, Kazaulik, and other cities in which Bulgarians, the moment they were at liberty to work their will, fell upon their peaceful neighbours the Jews.²¹⁶

²¹³ Ferguson, *The House of Rothschild*, 327–8.

²¹⁴ Hansard, 29 Mar. 1867, clxxxvi, col. 839.

²¹⁵ *JC*, 1 Sept. 1876, 339.

²¹⁶ *Ibid.* 5 Oct. 1877, 10. Other Jewish reasons probably reinforced this viewpoint. Some Jews had considerable investments in Turkey that would have been endangered

Only De Worms, not yet an MP, attempted a more comprehensive vindication of his position, actively defending Turkey in lectures and his work *England's Policy in the East*, which went through five editions in 1877.²¹⁷ These endeavours helped establish his political reputation. Savaging Russian machinations—he was later to blame them for orchestrating the original massacres—and castigating the opposition for encouraging ‘an unnatural alliance between free England and despotic Russia’, de Worms linked Tory policy in the East with the Palmerstonian tradition of defending English self-interest.²¹⁸ Referring often to the historical example of the Crimean War, de Worms professed: ‘I am one of those who think that the existence of Turkey is a necessity, not *qua* Turkey but *qua* England.’²¹⁹ Problematically, this argument, and the position of Jews generally, transgressed several of the English ideals they had previously advocated. Jews were defending Turkey, hardly a civilized state by British standards, and one obviously prejudiced towards its minorities, through a policy that could well require intervention and conflict. This was an extraordinary prioritizing of Jewish sympathy.

Unfortunately for Jewry, on this occasion, it could not be conflated with British concerns. The Bulgarian Agitation had sharply split public opinion and both sides claimed to represent the genuine values of the country.²²⁰ In overwhelmingly backing Disraelian policy, when the population surrounding it was fiercely at variance, Jewry marked itself as different; a development that did not go unnoticed or uncriticized. Many Liberals (correctly, if somewhat pejoratively) ascribed this position to ‘Mosaic tendencies’, which they located outside the traditions of English morality.²²¹ Groups that had supported Jewish emancipation—nonconformists, radicals, and Liberal intellectuals—now criticized the community as ‘unpatriotic

if the Empire was dissected; most were generally anti-Russian and would have been naturally suspicious of Christian agitation. See Feldman, *Englishmen*, 97–8.

²¹⁷ H. de Worms, *England's Policy in the East* (London, 1877).

²¹⁸ *Ibid.* 45, 51, and *Home and Foreign Policy of the Conservative Government*, 39, 44.

²¹⁹ *Home and Foreign Policy of the Conservative Government*, 7, 13.

²²⁰ Parry, *Democracy*, 432, and Seton-Watson, *Disraeli*, 236. These divisions even ran through political parties: moderate Liberals being suspicious of the agitation whereas most nonconformists and Anglo-Catholics supported it; the Tory party being split between pro-Turks and men like Derby who held war in greater horror than increased Russian influence.

²²¹ *JC*, 5 July 1878, 7.

and anti-English'.²²² Gladstone himself, in an interview with the editor of the *Jewish Chronicle*,

lamented that the Judaic sympathies both within the Jewish community, but still more markedly among Jewish sympathisers, should be on the side of Turkey, which militated against the spread of civilisation, and was unnatural to the Jewish people, who themselves had suffered so much from persecution.²²³

The Jewish community unconvincingly protested its neutrality, the *JC* 'denying the existence of any Jewish policy in contradistinction and opposition to that of the general populations among which the lot of the Jew is cast'.²²⁴ Some MPs did show a genuine empathy with the suffering Bulgarians: Simon presided over a protest meeting and Francis Goldsmid contributed £200 to the relief fund.²²⁵ But bias over Turkey's future was difficult to refute. Goldsmid was prepared 'to risk his seat and to sacrifice all personal considerations of private friendship and party ties' over the matter.²²⁶ Simon, the one Jew to partake in Commons debates concerning the crisis, only asked questions regarding Christian outrages against Jews and the guarantee of Jewish rights in any permanent settlement.²²⁷ Even the attempts made by Arthur Cohen to

²²² Feldman, *Englishmen*, 94, and *JC*, 5 Oct. 1877, 9. Retrospectively, the Agitation can be seen as another, and perhaps the final, step in Anglo-Jewry's distancing from the nonconformist model of minority existence. The two decades since emancipation had witnessed Jews beginning to form their own standpoints on issues of religious equality, which, more often practical than principled, diverged from the majority of nonconformist positions. The Agitation, one of the greatest of all expressions of the 'nonconformist conscience', can be seen as the extreme example of this development. Nonconformists, however, do not seem to have recognized this lost affinity and included it in their criticism during the Agitation. H.H.J. was one of the few commentators to pick up (albeit crudely) on the divergence: 'It is worthy to remark that, though the Jews in England have, in recent years, taken an active part in the agitation for civil and religious liberty . . . they have studiously avoided all participation in the efforts made to secure the Christians in Turkey from Ottoman tyranny . . . a course that is diametrically opposed to the principles they always hitherto professed.' H.H.J., *Breakers Ahead! or the Doomed Ship, the Determined Captain, and the Docile Crew: A Review of Lord Beaconsfield's Policy* (London, 1878), 7.

²²³ *JC*, 3 Nov. 1876, 486.

²²⁴ *Ibid.* 5 Oct. 1877, 9.

²²⁵ *Ibid.* 29 Sept. 1876, 402, and 12 Jan. 1877, 12.

²²⁶ A. Löwy and D. Marks, *A Memoir of Sir Francis Henry Goldsmid* (London, 1879), 74.

²²⁷ See Hansard, General Index, 1877 and 1878. Julian Goldsmid did ask four miscellaneous questions in 1878, which were all related to minor details of a possible peace settlement and do not of themselves indicate an active interest or intervention upon the subject.

maintain Liberal Jews' loyalty were pitched in confessional rather than national terms.²²⁸

It is worth considering the implications of the Eastern Question on Anglo-Jewry's position in Britain at greater length, for these went beyond the narrowly political. The Question offered the starkest illustration, to both Jews and Gentiles, that the issue of the minority's identity was still an unresolved matter. 'We have yet, completely, to prove to the world that we are integral parts of the state-organisation, and that we stand and fall by it alone, however much we recognise the fact among ourselves,' reflected the *JC* some years later.²²⁹ The community had not expected this. Whilst realizing that too much Jewishness in politics was controversial, Jews had begun to hope that their British nationality was beyond serious conjecture, even when they supported transnational Jewish interests. The post-emancipation era had started brightly in this respect, with widespread Gentile condemnation of Jewish oppression in the case of Edgardo Mortara, convincing the *JC* that 'the fraternisation of the human species has commenced'.²³⁰

The Mortara Affair began in September 1858, with the Papacy's 'abduction' of a 6-year-old Jewish boy secretly baptized by his Christian nursemaid in Bologna. The Papacy's subsequent refusal to return Mortara to his family and determination to raise him as a Catholic sparked a wave of outrage across Europe during 1859–60.²³¹ In Britain, Protestant organizations held numerous meetings to express solidarity with the oppressed Italian Jews and to encourage the government's intervention. The Evangelical Alliance was particularly active, organizing petitions and deputations, and pushing the Board of Deputies to continued efforts; hoping that 'it may not be useless for it to be known that the Protestants of Christendom are resolved to sustain the Jews in their just claims'.²³² This sympathy was offered not in spite of but in

²²⁸ *The Times*, 2 Feb. 1877, 6, and 24 Dec. 1879, 6. Cohen was among the minority of Jews who remained loyal to Gladstone during the crisis. More consistent than many in his attitudes, he criticized the Turks as a people incapable of progressive development.

²²⁹ *Ibid.* ²³⁰ *Ibid.* 4 Mar. 1859, 3.

²³¹ For a complete account of the Mortara Affair see D. Kertzer, *The Kidnapping of Edgardo Mortara* (London, 1997).

²³² *The Times*, 28 Dec. 1858, 4. The Evangelical Alliance later organized a significant petition to record the protest of British Christians against Mortara's continued detention. This contained the signatures of over 450 notable Christians, including 79 mayors and provosts, 27 peers, 22 bishops and archbishops, and 34 MPs. See *The Times*, 19 Oct. 1859, 10, and 8 Nov. 1859, 11. Other examples of Protestant groups moved to protest include: the Protestant Alliance; the Scottish Reformation Society, and the

explicit alignment with the international efforts of Jews across Europe. *The Times* lauded Moses Montefiore's unsuccessful mission of 1860 to appeal to the Pope, whilst the Evangelical Alliance recorded support for the efforts of the Jews of Italy, England, and France, and urged 'the Jews of Europe' to greater efforts.²³³

The dramatically different reactions to the Mortara Affair and the Eastern Question derived from the British public's ability to relate the respective Jewish cause, positively or negatively, to their perception of British identity and its ideals. For Protestant Britain, the Mortara Affair, occurring against the backdrop of battles for Italian reunification, became more than a run-of-the-mill case of religious liberty as it provided a contemporary outlet and reinforcing justification for the nation's historic anti-papal prejudices. Protests therefore contributed to both supporting a practical foreign policy goal, the end of papal rule in central Italy, whilst also reinforcing Britain's sense of moral superiority. The *JC* was quick to sublimate the Jews' cause to these wider currents and with little sense of exaggeration claimed: 'the most powerful auxiliary of the Italian movement, who with a feeble hand imparted to it an impetus such as no giant have given it, was the child Mortara.'²³⁴

The Eastern Question was far more complex. There was no black and white choice between religious liberty and papal tyranny but more complicated calculations regarding Britain's moral and material interests in the cauldron of the Near East, as well as its relationship with Russia. Exacerbating this was the changed (and changing) nature of domestic politics. Following the 1867 Reform Act, a number of groups of varying political and religious persuasions united behind the Liberal party in the hope that the extended franchise would lead to more harmonious government and the redress of long-standing problems in religious and social relations.²³⁵ These expectations were held most fervently by certain radical elements, drawn largely from sections of nonconformity, academia, and working men—the same people that protested most vigorously in the Bulgarian Agitation. Disaffected by the petering out of reforms and return of internecine Liberal squabbling in Gladstone's first ministry, these groups became infuriated by the unresponsive

National Protestant Society. See *The Times*, 17 Dec. 1858, 7, the *JC*, 3 Dec. 1858, 2, and 18 Feb. 1859, 3.

²³³ *The Times*, 23 Nov. 1858, 4, and 28 Dec. 1858, 5.

²³⁴ *JC*, 14 Dec. 1860, 4. ²³⁵ Feldman, *Englishmen*, 119.

and apparently uninterested reaction of Disraeli's government to the Bulgarian atrocities. The promise of 1867 appeared empty.²³⁶

This context made the Eastern Question 'a conflict between contending definitions of patriotism and of the nation's true identity'.²³⁷ Indignant sections of Liberal opinion found a convenient explanation for their thwarted expectations in Disraeli's premiership; specifically, the influence of his Jewish heritage on English politics. With wider Tory opinion and even the Cabinet thought to be equivocal, the blame for Britain's dispassionate foreign policy was reductively placed on the 'Semitic adventurer', and his alleged oriental and alien inspirations.²³⁸ Although many commentators satisfied themselves with calumniating Disraeli, the fundamental implication that Jewishness was not consonant with Englishness inevitably reflected on the Anglo-Jewish community. With the minority's partisan stance on the Question, some Liberal critics went further and explicitly attacked them, often employing remarkably anti-Semitic language. Oxford historian E. A. Freeman provided perhaps the most high-profile example in his 'political rather than historical' polemic against the Turkish Empire: *The Ottoman Power in Europe*.²³⁹

There is another power against which England and Europe ought to be yet more carefully on their guard. It is of no use mincing matters. The time has come to speak out plainly. No well disposed person would reproach another either with his nationality or his religion, unless that nationality or that religion leads to some direct mischief. No one wishes to place the Jew, whether Jew by birth or religion, under any disability as compared with the European Christian. . . . There is all the difference in the world between the degraded Jews of the East and the cultivated and honourable Jews of the West. But blood is stronger than water, and Hebrew rule is sure to lead to a Hebrew policy.²⁴⁰

This was the first significant use of anti-Semitism in modern Britain. Freeman's work and his wider anti-Jewish prejudice are notable for their racial conceptualization. In contradiction to the understanding of emancipation that Jews were merely another religious sect, Freeman and other critical Liberals, encouraged by their focus on the converted Disraeli, justified their opposition by racial distinctions between Jews and Englishmen. The antipathy displayed during the Eastern Question

²³⁶ Feldman, *Englishmen*, 120.

²³⁷ *Ibid.* 115.

²³⁸ H.H.J., *Breakers Ahead!*, 6–7.

²³⁹ E. A. Freeman, *The Ottoman Power in Europe: Its Nature, its Growth, and its Decline* (London, 1877).

²⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. xviii–xx.

was qualitatively different from previous anti-Jewish sentiment; it was, for instance, a more virulent prejudice than the vague and religiously based resentment that Julian Goldsmid encountered in Rochester. As such, the Eastern Question marked the beginning of two long-term trends within the British experience of anti-Semitism. One was the racial justification of anti-Jewish animosity, which would surface again during the anti-alien agitation against Jewish immigrants in the 1890s. The other was a phenomenon whereby elements in the British left espoused criticism of Jewish identity and actions they believed inconsistent with Britain's needs. The next manifestation of this came with the Boer War, where radicals, most notably J. A. Hobson, credited the conflict to the machinations of Jewish capitalists.²⁴¹

Although few were as sinister as Freeman, the widespread negative associations concerning Jewishness evoked during the Eastern Question starkly reveal the continuing existence of anti-Jewish prejudice in post-emancipation Britain. Although divorced from social and legal realities, and also Christians' actual behaviour towards Jews—as can be evinced from the qualified hesitancy with which Freeman broached the topic—recourse to prejudice, as Endelman notes, was evidently routine and unthinking.²⁴² In a similar manner to the only previous large-scale anti-Jewish agitation in modern Britain, the 1753 Jew Bill controversy, with a particular conception of British identity threatened, anti-Jewish existential discourse, largely absent from everyday life, resurfaced as a convenient indicator of desired boundaries. Despite their gradual and relatively serene emancipation, Jews could still be classed as 'other' if wider society perceived any failure on their part to remain within the core contextual limits of British identity, even though these were multifaceted and evolving.

The Eastern Crisis was an aberration in the post-emancipation era. Jewish politicians and the wider community were usually careful to avoid clashes with Christian sensitivities and, even more so, the appearance of possessing a supranational identity. Such considerations had not witnessed Anglo-Jewry, however, completely abandon representing the cause of their foreign brethren within British politics. Both before and after the Bulgarian Agitation a small group of Jewish politicians attempted to use their influence as English MPs to assist their co-religionists

²⁴¹ For a history of modern British anti-Semitism see C. Holmes, *Antisemitism in British Society, 1876–1939* (London, 1979).

²⁴² T. Endelman, *The Jews of Britain, 1656 to 2000* (London, 2002), 152.

abroad: notably, to ameliorate cases of persecution. Denouncing foreign anti-Semitism, updating the state of House intelligence, and enquiring of British ambassadorial intentions in disturbed regions, the MPs regularly highlighted international Jews' plight, a task they viewed as incumbent upon them not merely as Jews, but as the most privileged of Jews. 'When I contrast the condition of my religious community here,' moralized F. Goldsmid,

with their condition in Servia and Roumania [*sic*]—when I remember that we are here not only in the enjoyment of all civil and political rights, but that several of us have the honour of being members of this Assembly and can, in this place, make our voices heard . . . I cannot, I must own, resist the appeal which has been made to me.²⁴³

As in the domestic sphere, Gentiles appear to have expected such partisan actions and even been happy to accommodate them. No Jewish MP was ever abused for this activity. Some of their exertions were actually lauded by other politicians; as Mr Darby-Griffith complemented Goldsmid: 'No part of the literary efforts of a right hon. Gentleman who held a prominent position in that House was more interesting or more to his credit than the defence he had opened for that race.'²⁴⁴

Principally, this was because they operated within the boundaries of acceptable Jewish behaviour. The MPs were aware of the delicate nature of their efforts, which were, consequently, tightly self-regulated and very formulaic. Any possible conflict between Jewishness and Englishness was overcome by following a well-established pattern. Appeals were made, for a start, not as Jewish MPs but as MPs of the Jewish persuasion. Particular interests were subsumed within the pieties of national ideology: England's responsibility to advance its morality and civilization to the downtrodden.²⁴⁵ Simon, protesting Romanian Jews' treatment, admitted his personal Jewish concern: 'he should, however, as an Englishman have felt it to be equally his duty to raise his voice in behalf of the victims of these outrages had they been members of a different religious communion.'²⁴⁶ In conjunction with this, much time was spent referring to treaty rights and the precedence of international

²⁴³ Hansard, 19 Apr. 1872, ccx, col. 1586.

²⁴⁴ Ibid. 5 July 1867, clxxxviii, col. 1139.

²⁴⁵ Feldman, *Englishmen*, 122. To further generalize these appeals, calls for assistance were, whenever possible, made in the name of all non-Muslim or non-Orthodox religions, depending upon the territory. Jewish specifics were seldom prominent.

²⁴⁶ Hansard, 19 Apr. 1872, ccx, col. 1601.

law, to demonstrate that Britain was entitled to intervene.²⁴⁷ As a result, though, the geography of appeals was severely restricted. Whereas weak countries and those subject to international arbitration were frequently indicted, for instance Morocco, Romania, and Serbia, independent powers, such as Germany, Austria, or Russia, though they might experience considerable anti-Jewish agitation, were never reproached by Jewish politicians in the House.²⁴⁸ Strict limits were also placed upon the action requested. The primary aim of most Jewish MPs was to publicize grievances and gain expressions of Gentile sympathy; it was 'hoped that the discussion of the subject in the British House of Commons would have a moral effect'.²⁴⁹ If more direct action was solicited it was merely that the government make 'unofficial and friendly' suggestions to the country concerned.²⁵⁰ Undertaken in this restricted manner, these efforts were ineffective. The continuing pleas of Jewish MPs demonstrate that they were unable to achieve any permanent improvements for foreign Jews. It is unlikely that they could have done more. These inhibited efforts were still a remarkable indication of the continuing bond English Jews felt with their international co-religionists, for whom they were willing to mobilize British resources. Emancipation may have constrained Anglo-Jewry's Diasporic connections but it had not negated them.

These constraints were, of course, largely assumed and by no means permanent. As the Bulgarian Crisis had seen Jews increase their partisan input to British foreign affairs, so the situation concerning these specifically confessional appeals could be adapted to changing circumstances. In a move that illustrates the fluidity of Anglo-Jewish definition within the political sphere, de Worms attempted to reassess the established pattern in 1882, over the matter of the Russian pogroms. Having niggled the Liberal ministry with standard questions in 1881, frustrated by lack of progress, he sought to achieve a more robust consideration of Jewish interests. In March 1882 he moved a Commons motion urging the government to greater efforts to halt Russian persecution:

That this House, deeply deploring the persecution and outrages to which the Jews have been subjected in portions of the Russian Empire, trusts that Her Majesty's Government will find means . . . of using their good offices with the

²⁴⁷ Ibid. 29 Mar. 1867, clxxxvi, col. 839, and 17 Feb. 1880, ccl, cols. 794–5.

²⁴⁸ The one exception to this pattern was Francis Goldsmid's indictment of Russia for the persecution of Jews at Saratow, June 1862. Relations with Russia were probably still frosty enough, post-Crimea, for criticism of the country to be acceptable.

²⁴⁹ Löwy and Marks, *A Memoir*, 192.

²⁵⁰ Ibid. 187.

Government of His Majesty the Czar to prevent the recurrence of similar acts of violence.²⁵¹

Gladstone's government, the Liberal party, and most Tories were hostile. All de Worms obtained were a few routine expressions of ministerial sympathy and he was forced to withdraw.²⁵² Parliament had clearly indicated the extent of its compassion for international Jewry; de Worms's action had obviously exceeded an acceptable level of Jewishness. Interestingly, it appears that other Jewish MPs shared this sentiment, for none supported the motion. Simon and Cohen had, in fact, led attempts to defeat it; ostensibly, because they did not believe it would be efficacious.²⁵³

Beneath this reasoning, though, there were other motivations. Party politics exercised a notable influence. De Worms had been at pains to stress the apolitical character of his motion. But the very consistency with which he did so gave the lie to his efforts. Frequently quoting Gladstone, de Worms repeatedly attempted to embarrass the Liberal party by contrasting its interventionist attitude during the Bulgarian Crisis with its reticence concerning Russia: 'The appeal which was made in England on behalf of the Bulgarians was made in the same spirit of generosity as that with which this appeal and this plea is made.'²⁵⁴ A double standard in Liberal sympathy was suggested.²⁵⁵ Simon, ever defending the Liberal cause, denied this and criticized de Worms's partisan tactics.

Simon and A. Cohen, working in tandem, were, though, perhaps more guilty of political sectarianism. Cohen had been passing inside information about the situation in Russia, obtained from Anglo-Jewish institutions, to the Liberals—'I will, if you like, keep you fully informed of all that it might be useful for you to know'—and advising Dilke on how to mollify the community without making political concessions.²⁵⁶ Months

²⁵¹ Hansard, 3 Mar. 1882, cclxcii, col. 30.

²⁵² *Ibid.*, cols. 50–70.

²⁵³ *Ibid.*, col. 43. Simon and Cohen claimed that any effort Britain might make, almost certain to be ineffective, would only serve to further agitate Russians against Jewry. De Worms expressed the opinion that it could not hurt to try, considering the present situation.

²⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, col. 31.

²⁵⁵ *Ibid.* 19 May 1881, cclxi, col. 805. As de Worms had accused before: 'Is it to be understood that, in the case of governments of importance like Russia, Her Majesty's government do not intend to protest cases of oppression, but that their protests are only to be directed against weaker governments?'

²⁵⁶ British Library, Add. MSS 43880, fo. 142, Papers of Sir Charles Wentworth Dilke, Letter from Arthur Cohen to Dilke, 7 Mar. 1882.

before the motion Simon had twice written to Gladstone imploring him to make 'some expression of sympathy' before the Tories could capitalize on the situation through de Worms's efforts.²⁵⁷ His motivation, he stressed, was not concern for Russian Jewry; 'it is not on their account that I have ventured to trouble you but from a deep conviction that the interests of the Liberal party, as well as . . . the government require that something should be said.'²⁵⁸ All three of these Jewish MPs thus exploited their involvement in Jewish interests to benefit their party politics; in the case of Simon and Cohen this was done, seemingly, to the detriment of the Jewish cause.

The perception these politicians held regarding the appropriate role of Jewishness in politics motivated this. For Simon and Cohen, the two Jews most notable for their loyalty to Gladstone over Bulgaria, it could never transcend national issues; especially as, in this case, they were mixed up with vindication of Liberal party policy. De Worms, too, would never have countenanced promoting Jewish issues over national ones, but he judged England's political context differently. Using the Bulgarian Agitation as a point of reference he misread the situation. Taking his lead from inflamed public opinion de Worms believed that Britain was now prepared to pursue minority issues and, therefore, a more active style of Jewish protest could be advanced.²⁵⁹ He was wrong. Unlike the case of Bulgaria, the public mood of 1882 did not demand action; it demurred to Parliament, where neither party was interested in adopting the cause.²⁶⁰ Simon and Cohen had a better grasp of the situation. Russia was an independent power, with whom Parliament had no legal or diplomatic right or ability to interfere. 'What right had this country to pass a vote of censure upon a foreign power?' Simon pontificated. 'It was the very A, B, C of international law that one independent country should not interfere with the internal affairs of another country.'²⁶¹ Furthermore, relations were becoming increasingly

²⁵⁷ Bodleian Library Microfilm, Add. MS 44474, fo. 103, Papers of William Ewart Gladstone, Letter from Simon to Gladstone, 29 Jan. 1882, and fo. 133, 5 Feb. 1882.

²⁵⁸ Ibid., MS 44474, fo. 133, Letter from Simon to Gladstone, 5 Feb. 1882. Simon was probably playing to his recipient's sensibilities somewhat; it would have been unlikely that an appeal on Jewry's behalf would have convinced Gladstone to act.

²⁵⁹ Hansard, 3 Mar. 1882, cclxvii, col. 34.

²⁶⁰ Feldman, *Englishmen*, 133. After this incident de Worms seems to have realized that he had overstepped the mark and all his subsequent Jewish appeals reverted to the established formula.

²⁶¹ Hansard, 3 Mar. 1882, cclxvii, cols. 42, 45.

friendly between the two countries and an incident could not be risked on account of the Jews.²⁶² British realpolitik militated against action.

Simon and Cohen realized this and as Englishmen, of course, concurred. In these circumstances Simon saw no benefit to 'dragging the unfortunate Jews and their sufferings before the House of Commons'.²⁶³ Nothing said in Parliament, Cohen agreed, could augment the good effect already achieved by a 'remarkable manifestation of public opinion'.²⁶⁴ And it was in this arena that these two politicians felt it appropriate to exercise their Jewish sympathies: Cohen assisting the Russo-Jewish Committee and Simon organizing the fund-raising Mansion House meeting.²⁶⁵ The *JC*, having advised de Worms to withdraw his motion, endorsed this low-key perspective: 'Many noble examples of self-restraint have been given by prominent Jewish political personages during the agitation against the Russian atrocities.'²⁶⁶ The paper's uncharacteristic timidity reinforced Simon's statement to the House that 'persons of position in the Jewish community, to whose opinion weight ought to be attached, did not wish this subject to be brought forward'.²⁶⁷ This claim was somewhat disingenuous, however, Simon having confided to Gladstone months earlier the existence of a contrary sentiment: 'there is beginning to grow up among some people a fear lest you might not be as willing to act for their brethren in Russia . . . as on behalf of the Bulgarian Christians.'²⁶⁸

Indeed, Jewish opinion on this emotional issue was far from unanimous. The council of the Anglo-Jewish Association strongly backed de Worms, uniformly passing a resolution of 'cordial thanks' for his action. Simon, present at the meeting, petulantly took the measure 'to imply a vote of censure on his own action in the same affair' and, feeling that 'it was impossible to work longer with Baron Henry de Worms', resigned

²⁶² Bodleian Library Microfilm, Add. MS 44474, fo. 133, Papers of William Ewart Gladstone, Letter from Simon to Gladstone, 5 Feb. 1882. and Hansard, Mar. 1882, cclxvii, cols. 41–2, 45.

²⁶³ Hansard, 3 Mar. 1882, cclxvii, col. 42.

²⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, col. 58.

²⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, col. 57, and Alderman, *Jewish Community*, 33.

²⁶⁶ *JC*, 10 Feb. 1882, 5.

²⁶⁷ Hansard, 3 Mar. 1882, cclxvii, col. 45. The *JC* endorsed Simon's conviction that the motion would not assist Russian Jews and was considerably upset by the temper of the debate. It lamented that Jewish politicians could behave so over a Jewish matter and wistfully remembered the 'cautious candour and the courteous argument' Francis Goldsmid had always used when discoursing such subjects. See *JC*, 10 Mar. 1882, 11.

²⁶⁸ Bodleian Library Microfilm, Add. MS 44474, fo. 103, Papers of William Ewart Gladstone, Letter from Simon to Gladstone, 29 Jan. 1882.

his vice-presidency before walking out.²⁶⁹ De Worms gloatingly took revenge for his Commons' defeat, expressing thanks whilst maintaining 'that the action taken by Serjeant Simon and Mr. Arthur Cohen had done more to injure the Jewish cause than the calumnies levelled at the Jews'.²⁷⁰ There was evidently no consensus within the Jewish body about the level of political effort that should be risked upon the causes of their foreign brethren. Jewish MP clashed publicly with Jewish MP and, due to their role as communal representatives, these disputes echoed within the community institutions they served. Jewish politics and the politics of Jewry were intricately linked, if not harmonized.

VI

Jewish MPs are a revealing source of study for both Jewish politics and Jewish identity. Few were energetic politicians, but their numbers steadily increased and some achieved notable success, particularly at constituency level, an indication of the quick integration these MPs achieved in the political sphere, where their Jewish allegiance was generally unproblematic. This accommodation occurred even though Jewishness carried certain associations and requirements into the public realm; for Gentiles regarded Jewish MPs as politically representative of the community, as much as they themselves and other Jews did. Jewish politicians exploited this perception to introduce Jewish issues and bring a confessional perspective to their opinions. But in doing so they were usually deferential to their English influences, and positions on matters of national interest, as well as issues of Jewish concern, were alike adopted primarily in accordance with an individual's party-political stance. There was little in Jews' behaviour to distinguish them from their Gentile peers and they seem, essentially, to have acted predominantly like most other British politicians of the time. Jewish MPs thus routinely held various and often opposing viewpoints. This ambiguous situation, in effect, meant these politicians operated as both MPs of the Jewish persuasion and Jewish MPs.

²⁶⁹ University of Southampton Library, MS 137, Papers of the Anglo-Jewish Association, Council Minute Book, ii. 16–20. and *JC*, 10 Mar. 1882, 8. The meeting (and the next) subsequently passed resolutions denying any criticism of Simon and calling upon him to withdraw his resignation, though it remained unapologetically behind de Worms. Within days Simon had magnanimously done so: 'In the interests of the Association . . .'

²⁷⁰ *JC*, 10 Mar. 1882, 8.

It was a duality that perfectly reflected, and indeed was a partial manifestation of—partial contributor towards—Jewry’s post-emancipation identity. Reassured that they were indeed English, it became increasingly evident to Jews that their task in the decades following 1858 was to ensure they remained Jewish. Not in the old sense of *imperium in imperio*, which was to be avoided at all costs, but still more than the whitewashed copy of nonconformity some emancipationists had expected.²⁷¹ The period witnessed various political events that both highlighted and threatened the community’s distinctiveness, demonstrating that emancipation had not permanently resolved Jews’ status. A specific Jewish standpoint thus began to emerge within British politics, as they attempted to negotiate an acceptable one. Mirroring the unique situation of the Anglo-Jew, this was to incorporate support for both equality and exceptionalism:

The relation of the Jew to the peoples amongst whom he resides presents this startling anomaly—he is an alien whom no legal ‘naturalisation’ can transform; and at the same time he is a countryman by birth . . . And this dual nature no amount of time can destroy; but, on the contrary, it will become more marked and intensified as the legislatures of enlightened countries afford the Jews opportunities of showing that whilst a religious principle is sufficient to preserve the homogeneity of an entire people, it is not incompatible with the sincerest devotion to the best interests of a state.²⁷²

There was no framework to guide this interaction—there were perceived boundaries, though no one was sure where to locate these—and Jewish MPs displayed a variety of opinions concerning the most desirable mixture of these English and Jewish elements. Jewish political identity incorporated a range of conceptions; it was fragmented but flexible. Crucially, though, many MPs exhibited a desire for greater recognition of their particularity, to politically identify Jewry as a unique interest group within the body politic, rather than merely another confession with equal rights.

This shift in self-perception occasioned Jewry’s growing break with the nonconformist model of existence it had emulated prior to 1858. Not all Jewish politicians endorsed this change: Simon ‘remained an earnest Dissenter’ his whole career.²⁷³ The communal majority, though, came to believe ‘that Jews are not Dissenters; that their interests, as

²⁷¹ *JC*, 6 Feb. 1874, 753.

²⁷² *Ibid.* 28 Aug. 1872, 291.

²⁷³ *Derby Daily Telegraph*, 12 Nov. 1885, 4.

affected by their religion, differ widely and essentially from those of other denominations which are not of the state religion'.²⁷⁴

Jewry recognized that politically, more than other minorities, it had to take steps to protect its particular collectivity, which was united not solely by religious precepts—as was nonconformity—but also an undefined yet tenacious ethno-racial connection. However, if Jewry were to be allowed fidelity to its faith, so other religions must be accorded theirs. Being distinctive required the reciprocal appreciation of other religions' specificity, and many Jewish MPs accordingly endorsed this, supporting, for instance, the Anglican Establishment and the denominational clauses of the Education Act. This created a tension within Anglo-Jewish politics. The principles of equality Anglo-Jewry had previously championed could not be totally abandoned. They had been a fundamental argument of emancipation and, of course, remained crucial to the community's participation in all aspects of British life. Much of Jewry's political activity in this period therefore concerned an attempt to establish, as the situation demanded, an appropriate balance between these two determinants. Jewish MPs, divided in their efforts at times on account of their political persuasion, pursued a compromise agenda between equality and particularity; a position that was anathema to nonconformists and that increasingly distinguished them from a considerable portion of Liberal party opinion.

It was not always difficult for Jews to achieve a balanced political participation. There was not a constant antagonism between the requirements of their English and Jewish elements. The British system, long used to treating with minorities, offered much scope for the smooth interaction of the two, which in many instances actually operated symbiotically, one complementing the other. The *JC* was being only slightly optimistic when it decreed: 'As Jews let us be earnest Jews; as Englishmen let us be earnest Englishmen. The duties of our faith and race will not interfere with our duties of citizenship.'²⁷⁵ In this period, Jewish virtues correlated remarkably with accepted English ones. It was not, of course, an equal partnership. While Jewishness remained an important reference in the MPs' political value system, English considerations were almost always accorded paramount importance. Jewish issues, when advocated, were thus subjected to a variety of limitations and usually sublimated to loftier causes in an attempt to prevent any conflict of interests. Nevertheless, Jewish political definition was nebulous enough

²⁷⁴ *JC*, 24 June 1870, 9.

²⁷⁵ *Ibid.* 6 Feb. 1874, 753.

for Jewish MPs to attain a considerable level of exception. The precise extent of this was never evident, however. Generally reliant upon the prevailing English climate, Jewish politicians occasionally misjudged their attempts, prioritizing Jewishness to an unacceptable degree. This happened most notoriously during the Bulgarian Crisis, when an explicit demonstration of political Jewishness bereft of any justifying English conceptuality brought calumny upon the community and reinvigorated debate on their patriotism. Much pained by the episode, Jewry began explicitly reorienting its party allegiance—till this time incestuously connected to the Liberals—into a more open position. The community was not politically confident enough to withstand such criticism; as much as Jews appreciated utilizing their indeterminate identity to positively obtain specificity, they were not yet prepared for this to be openly discussed and possibly generate negative consequences.

3

Representation, Coordination, and Civilization

The Board of Deputies of British Jews and Communal Government

I

The Board of Deputies of British Jews was the pre-eminent Anglo-Jewish institution of the nineteenth century. As ‘the only recognised official medium of communication between the various departments of the state and the Jewish community’, the Board’s self-appointed task was to

make observation of all proceedings relative to legislative and municipal enactments, and . . . use such means as they may deem requisite in order that no infraction of the religious rights, customs and privileges of the Jewish community may ensue there from; they shall also watch over the interests of the Jews of this Empire, and deliberate on what may conduce to their welfare and improve their general condition.¹

Its aim was nothing less than the conciliation of the Jewish and British worlds—to mediate the existence of Anglo-Jewry in modern Britain. By the achievement of emancipation the Board had been fulfilling this role for nearly a century. British Jews traced its foundation back to a resolution of the Elders of the Spanish and Portuguese Congregation marking the coronation of George III in November 1760: ‘That seven gentlemen of this body be appointed . . . to testify to his Majesty our homage; and thereafter to deal with the most urgent matters which

¹ London Metropolitan Archives, ACC/3121/A/010, MBBB, 1864–71, x. 250, and *JC*, 23 Jan. 1874, 713.

present themselves in connection with our nation.² With the adherence of Ashkenazi delegates to present condolences and congratulations to the Dowager Princess of Wales that December, the first communal organization of Anglo-Jewry was born. The Board's activities, initially, were small scale, its meetings sporadic, and its long-term future uncertain. But spurred by the prospect of emancipation the institution was reorganized and placed upon a permanent footing over 1835–6. The adoption of a formal constitution, the establishment of a representative basis, the beginning of Moses Montefiore's long presidency, and the acquirement of statutory power to license Jewish marriage all occurred at this time, as the Board developed its modern form. This period also witnessed the formal naming of the institution as the London Committee of Deputies of British Jews. The title was chosen in deliberate imitation of the nonconformists' representative organization, the London Board of Dissenting Deputies—a clear statement of the place Anglo-Jewry believed it inhabited in Britain's religiously plural society.³

Post-emancipation, the Board continued to negotiate the minority's position and image within Britain and on the international Jewish scene, with varying rates of activity and success. Although not always achieving consensus, the Board was an undeniably important facet of the communal structure. C. Emanuel was not exaggerating when he stated in 1910: 'generation has succeeded generation, and, without show or fuss, the Board has made, and continues to make, Jewish history.'⁴ As Anglo-Jewry's nominally representative body charged with overseeing the smooth interaction of Jewish and English responsibilities, the Board of Deputies is of paramount significance to any study of Anglo-Jewish identity. The causes it pursued, for whom, and under whose authority, do much to illustrate what was important to British Jews, and reveal much about the self-image they sought to portray and their ability to accomplish this. Also, being the Jewish institution supposedly most intimately connected with the British state, a survey of the Board's activities will reveal aspects of British history. This chapter examines how the state, on various levels, officially treated the minority: what was its approach to Jewish requests for special treatment?

² C. Emanuel, *A Century and a Half of Jewish History: Extracted from the Minute Books of the London Committee of the Deputies of the British Jews* (London, 1910), 1.

³ W. Rubinstein, *A History of the Jews in the English-Speaking World: Great Britain* (London, 1996), 71.

⁴ Emanuel, *Century*, p. vi.

What does this indicate about the flexibility of British society and its attitude toward minorities, specifically the prejudice or lack thereof concerning Jews as citizens? The interaction of the Board and the state, particularly over foreign affairs, demonstrates the level to which Jews could participate within British identity as a specifically partisan body—compared to Jewish parliamentarians who were working within a national institution—and the terms society established for this.

It is all the more remarkable, therefore, that the Board should have virtually escaped historical examination. The historiography of the institution is almost non-existent. The institution received some coverage in several early communal histories, the most substantial of which was C. Emanuel's *A Century and a Half of Jewish History*, published in 1910.⁵ The work contains a useful factual account, as might be expected from a man who was its secretary and solicitor. However, Emanuel's intimacy with the organization also leads to bias, with disproportionate space devoted to Board successes and negative aspects being downplayed. The Board has fared little better in treatment from modern historians: merely one book and a smattering of articles have exclusively examined it. Aubrey Newman's *The Board of Deputies of British Jews, 1760–1985* offers a 'brief survey' of the major events and personalities that shaped the institution.⁶ The history, written with the Board's sanction to mark its anniversary, is not intended as a detailed study. It also focuses upon more recent experiences: only seventeen pages are set aside for the pre-1880 period.

The existing articles are more relevant. N. Grizzard's 'The Provinces and the Board, 1851–1901' addresses a particularly neglected feature of the Board's history and contains useful statistics on participation rates.⁷ D. Itzkowitz's 1992 work 'Cultural Pluralism and the Board of Deputies' highlights attempts to exempt the community from the provisions of general legislation, claiming that they represented a new kind of cultural pluralism within nineteenth-century Britain.⁸ As this

⁵ For other early communal comment see J. Picciotto, *Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History* (London, 1875) and *Jubilee of the Joint Foreign Committee, 1878–1928*, pamphlet issued by the Board of Deputies and the Anglo-Jewish Association (London, 1928).

⁶ A. Newman, *The Board of Deputies of British Jews, 1760–1985: A Brief Survey* (London, 1987).

⁷ N. Grizzard, 'The Provinces and the Board, 1851–1901', in A. Newman (ed.), *Provincial Jewry in Victorian Britain* (London, 1975).

⁸ D. Itzkowitz, 'Cultural Pluralism and the Board of Deputies of British Jews', in R. Davis and R. Helmstadter (eds.), *Religion and Irreligion in Victorian Society: Essays in Honour of R. K. Webb* (London, 1992).

chapter demonstrates, however, Itzkowitz's premiss is misconstrued. The exemptions Jews requested and those they were granted were perceived merely as another example of the religious pluralism that the British state had long accommodated, rather than any new arrangement. Jews certainly did not contemplate this differentiation as a separating act to further their subcultural existence but believed it their equal right as Englishmen to protect their religious consciences from infringement. Information on the Board can also be obtained from a related subject that has attracted far more historical attention: Sir Moses Montefiore. As a long-time member and President of the Deputies, research upon Montefiore inevitably provides material on the Board. Unfortunately most histories focus on his more sensational foreign ventures or generous philanthropy and only a few concentrate upon his connection to the Board.⁹ For the historian of the Deputies current historiography has little to offer and there remains a pressing need for a complete history of this central institution.¹⁰

This chapter contributes to rectifying this historical oversight. Specifically, it analyses the activities of the Board with a view to obtaining an insight into Anglo-Jewish identity and the nature of post-emancipation Jewish communal existence in Britain. A three-part examination is employed, loosely imitating the Jewish MPs' arrangement to better facilitate an appreciation of the multiple yet interlinked levels upon which certain issues affected the community and the different—at times even antagonistic—levels of Jewish elite thought concerning them. The first section addresses the Board of Deputies as an organization. Detailing its functions, operations, and personnel, it investigates the Board's representative nature and perceived role in the community. The next two parts build upon this information, demonstrating how, with this remit and composition, the Board positioned itself, and by extension Jewry, in both Jewish and Gentile society. The second

⁹ The two most useful to this study are I. Finestein, 'The Uneasy Victorian: Montefiore as Communal Leader', in S. Lipman and V. Lipman (eds.), *The Century of Moses Montefiore* (Oxford, 1985) and I. Finestein, 'Sir Moses Montefiore: A Modern Appreciation', in idem, *Scenes and Personalities in Anglo-Jewry, 1800–2000* (London, 2002).

¹⁰ There are good archival collections to facilitate this. Sources that have been used extensively throughout this chapter include the detailed reports and minute books of the Deputies, which contain *inter alia* most of their correspondence; collections of Montefiore's correspondence, considerable portions of which relate to the Board; and a series of Parliamentary Papers concerned with the Foreign Office's work for persecuted Jews.

section is concerned with the domestic sphere. Having identified in the last chapter an ambiguous Jewish political standpoint within national politics, this investigates Board attempts to protect what it perceived as the community's interests from a variety of incursions within the broader scope of British society and upon a wider range of levels and issues. This section demonstrates the confusing and often conflicting stance of a minority espousing both equality and exceptionality of treatment, as the disagreements between Jewish MPs have already outlined. The final section surveys the international undertakings of the Deputies. Beginning with an evaluation of the Board's motives and methods, its scope broadens through investigation of certain troublesome areas, in an attempt to explore the wider ramifications of Anglo-Jewish diplomacy upon both Jewish beliefs and contemporary British foreign policy. It shows that whilst Jewish MPs were able to introduce international Jewish issues into Parliament, communal institutions, using a more partisan identity, though similarly restricted in outcome, achieved a more remarkable conflation of Jewish and British ideals.

II

The Board of Deputies was the representative body of Anglo-Jewry. All Jewish congregations in Britain, with the exception of Reform ones, had the right to send a delegate to the Board, with the franchise granted to 'all *Yehidim* and male renters of seats in each congregation above the age of twenty-one years, and not in arrears in their payments to the congregation more than twelve months'.¹¹ These relatively liberal electoral criteria supplied the foundation of the Board's claimed mandate to speak for all British Jews. This assertion was, though, somewhat specious; for whilst the Board franchise was widely accorded it was far less actively employed. Comparing the number of synagogues that elected one or more Deputies with the number who registered marriage secretaries through the Board (a legal requirement and thus a good indication of the number of established Orthodox congregations), it can be observed that the Board's affiliates never comprised more than 55.9 per cent of the community (see Appendix 2). This high

¹¹ *JC*, 23 Jan. 1874, 713.

was only reached in 1883, prior to which the level had hovered under 40 per cent in the 1860s, peaked at 51.9 per cent in reaction to Gladstone's government in the early 1870s, and then declined again to approximately 46 per cent for the next ten years. The 1865–8 session was the lowest point, when merely 29.5 per cent of British congregations were represented.

There existed a major disjuncture between the Board's rhetoric of representation and reality. This anomaly did not go uncriticized in the community. 'A body acting for the whole community, while yet not resting upon the whole foundation offered by it, is an inverted pyramid,' warned the *JC* in 1858.¹² This 'tends to foster a spirit of oligarchy and exclusiveness'.¹³ The Deputies were slow to comprehend the connection between their popularity and their legitimacy as a putatively representative organ in an age of increasing democratization. A major constitutional reorganization designed to 'extend the influence and usefulness of the Board' did take place in 1882.¹⁴ It was a late but substantial move towards greater participation; introducing measures to encourage poorer synagogues and inviting imperial congregations to join, it increased representation by 10 per cent at the next election. This still left some 44 per cent of Orthodox congregations unaffiliated, and the Board would not shed its patrician image and appear genuinely representative until the twentieth century.¹⁵

During the post-emancipation era the Board's unrepresentative nature was exacerbated by the manner of those elections that did occur. These were hardly major affairs. In fact, most were hardly elections at all, merely nominations. Over the seven meetings of the Borough Synagogue to elect a deputy between 1868 and 1886, only two involved a contest.¹⁶ Similar scenes transpired at most other synagogues. Despite opening a ballot every time, in seven elections at the New Synagogue only one featured more than two candidates for two positions; at Bayswater, six meetings produced only one competitive election.¹⁷ Those few elections that involved contest were neither close-run nor dramatic

¹² *JC*, 4 June 1858, 196. ¹³ *Ibid.* 22 Apr. 1859, 4.

¹⁴ LMA, ACC/3121/G1/01/002, BDAR, 1880–9, Apr. 1883, 12–14.

¹⁵ A. Newman, 'The Board of Deputies', in *idem* (ed.), *Provincial Jewry*, 1.

¹⁶ LMA, ACC/2712/BRS/002, USP, Minute Books of the Borough Synagogue, 1873–96.

¹⁷ LMA, ACC/2712/BWS/004–5 USP, Minute Books of the Bayswater Synagogue, 1863–83, and LMA, ACC/2712/NWS/008B, Minute Book of the New Synagogue, 1868–96.

affairs. Four candidates were nominated at the New Synagogue in 1877: S. Schloss and H. Solomon, the incumbents, received 40 and 41 votes respectively, whereas Algernon Sydney and A. Silber, the challengers, managed a meagre seven votes between them.¹⁸ This appears even less impressive when it is considered that New had 366 enfranchised seatholders, and, each having two votes, might have recorded 732 votes instead of the 88 cast. Consistently poor turnout is a reproach to any representative institution and, as one astute, if acerbic, correspondent wrote in criticism, the organization 'would be ashamed to publish the exact quantity of votes registered at its elections'.¹⁹ Certainly, the method of electing Deputies was not the most democratic of processes and did nothing to encourage participation. It often had the appearance of an arrangement rather than an election. The candidates were always, at the least, current or former members of their synagogue councils, if not wardens, treasurers, and not infrequently presidents. The ruling group within the synagogues clearly controlled events and used them to extend and perpetuate their power. In many ways it was a form of cronyism, an old boy's club. The lack of interest this provoked in congregations, whilst certainly dissuasive for voters, should not be exaggerated. For many in the hierarchical synagogue system it would probably have appeared quite natural.

Approximately 138 individuals were elected as Deputies in the three decades following emancipation (see Appendix 3). There were twenty-five members sitting on the 1859 Board, a figure that rose steadily throughout the period, with the occasional fallback or large supplement, to fifty in 1886 (see Appendix 2). These represented a similarly increasing number of congregations, from the initial fifteen to thirty-three by 1883. Throughout the post-emancipation period the majority of these congregations were located in the provinces; however, the majority of deputies belonged to metropolitan synagogues—a sign of the institution's marked London bias.²⁰ The older, better attended, and crucially wealthier congregations of the capital dominated the Board. Bevis Marks was the greatest influence, electing five deputies, accommodating meetings in its vestry, and having its representatives as President for the majority of the century. The inadequacy of provincial

¹⁸ LMA, ACC/2712/NWS/008B, USP, Minute Book of the New Synagogue, 1868–96, 109–11.

¹⁹ *JC*, 27 May 1870, 4.

²⁰ Only the 1880–3 Board saw the number of provincial congregations fall below 50 per cent of the total electing representatives.

representation was a perennial communal issue, and would frequently surface whenever the Board's authority to speak for all Anglo-Jewry was questioned; as noted in Chapter 1 in the case of the 1853 debate on reform representation. The *JC* regularly lamented the barrier this set to provincial engagement in communal affairs:

A few congregations send their representatives to the Board of Deputies; but these representatives are in most cases gentlemen resident in London, whose association with it amounts to zero; they are delegates of congregations, but scarcely their representatives. The action of the provincial congregations in the great communal centre is a nullity; the interest taken in them is but small.²¹

The Board's metropolitan bias continued throughout the nineteenth century and it was not until the early twentieth century that provincial congregations, enlarged by mass immigration, began to assert an influence in communal governance proportionate to their size.

The post-emancipation Deputies were not the most notable of contemporary Anglo-Jews. The majority seem to have left little trace outside of the immediate Jewish world they inhabited. Anglo-Jewry (partly echoing their Victorian environment) had a very strong sense of community service, but many chose to exercise this in other areas than the Deputies. It was a perennial lament of the *JC* that 'there are men amongst us who know perhaps, from the circumstances of their vocation, position, or self-imposed duties, more than others of the wants and nature of our community; and yet all of these men, whose names are "familiar in our mouths as household words," are not members of the Board of Deputies'.²² Some eminent Jews were perforce excluded by the fact of their being Reformers; for instance, the Goldsmids and John Simon. The prohibition on Reform representatives was maintained for the majority of this era. Its incongruity, as the Board cooperated with Reform MPs on causes of religious liberty, was recurrently lambasted in the Jewish press. Salomons, having fallen out with the Board during the emancipation campaign, was another glaring exception. The Rothschild family, whilst repeatedly elected as Deputies for the Great, never once attended a meeting of the Board in this period—the family operated at a level far beyond the institution. Such absences could not but lessen the Deputies' authority. There were, of course, though, notable men actively involved in the Board's work. The institution from its inception had attracted

²¹ *JC*, 28 Nov. 1873, 581.

²² *Ibid.* 17 Sept. 1869, 7.

many of the community's leading lights. Post-emancipation, these included, *inter alia*, Benjamin Cohen, President of the Board of Guardians and Jews' hospital, JP, and member of the LCC; Henry Israel, City alderman, sheriff, and future mayor; Philip Magnus, educationalist, future MP, and baronet; Benjamin Philips, City alderman, councilman, sheriff, and mayor; and Joseph Sebag, millionaire, JP, and Lieutenant of the City.²³ Such men were certainly a credit to the Board and demonstrate that some, at least, of the Jewish elite regarded it as a worthwhile venture.

The most illustrious Board member was undoubtedly Sir Moses Montefiore. President at the time of emancipation, Montefiore had originally occupied the position in 1835 and, despite numerous gaps, would not relinquish it until 1874. Having served a total of twenty-eight years as President, spread over a thirty-nine-year period, during one of the most formative eras in Anglo-Jewish experience, Montefiore, more than any other person, became synonymous with the Deputies.²⁴ The *JC* talked of fusion: 'The respected and philanthropic President could with as much justice declare: The Board that is I, as a certain king said, *L'état c'est moi*.'²⁵ This was an immense boon for the Board's profile, as Montefiore was an international celebrity. The *JC* editorializing on his 1864 return from a mission in Morocco proclaimed: 'Modern Jewish history absolutely offers no parallel either to the man . . . or his glorious achievements.'²⁶ Gentiles were almost equally impressed with his efforts and Montefiore managed to meet a fantastic range of personages—tsars, shahs, princes, cardinals, and a multitude of lesser statesmen—in his lifetime of protesting Jewish rights. In Britain, he received utmost respect and congeniality from the authorities. In 1871, after his office had unsuccessfully attempted similar dissuasion, Lord Granville personally wrote to Montefiore expressing concern for his safety and reiterating the necessity of abandoning a journey to Persia.²⁷ Montefiore was intimate with the British establishment and also a hero figure for many Jews; it was the successful combination of Anglo and Jew to which the post-emancipation community aspired.

For the Board there could be no greater role model, particularly as they could partake in his success. Montefiore's stature reflected back

²³ See M. Jolles, *A Directory of Distinguished British Jews, 1830–1930: With Selected Compilations Extending from 1830 to 2000* (London, 2002).

²⁴ Finestein, 'Sir Moses', 169. ²⁵ *JC*, 13 Apr. 1877, 9.

²⁶ *JC*, 18 Mar. 1864, 4. ²⁷ LMA, ACC/3121/A/011, MBBD, 1871–8, xi, 77.

upon the body he headed and personified; 'Sir Moses's most glorious achievements were performed in the name of the Board of Deputies.'²⁸ 'It cannot be invidious to say that the connection of Sir Moses with the Board is one of its greatest sources of strength.'²⁹ The Board recognized the advantage of this attachment and went to considerable lengths to maintain it. Despite attempts by Montefiore to decline re-election as President in 1862, 1865, 1868, and 1871 on the grounds of ill health and incapacity, entreaties and pleadings from the Deputies persuaded him to remain, even though on occasion he was 'too unwell' to receive their deputation. Only after the repeated assertion of how 'utterly impossible' resumption would be for a now nonagenarian Montefiore was his retirement in 1874 accepted.³⁰ Yet the Board was still unwilling to let this connection end—the next three presidents, governing from 1874 to 1903, were all his nephews, a move motivated not just by sentimentality but a desire to extend the legacy of the most important man to serve on the institution. Appointing Joseph Mayer Montefiore his successor in 1874 the annual report claimed it had chosen 'one closely related to Sir Moses Montefiore, and bearing his honoured name, and who, being in frequent communication with the worthy Baronet, it was felt would preserve and maintain the traditional policy of the Board'.³¹ As one commentator observed, for much of the nineteenth century, one way or another, the Board of Deputies had been under the management of 'Montefiore and Co.'³²

The Deputies gained immensely from their association with Montefiore but there were also considerable drawbacks to the relationship. As much as Montefiore's name 'shed a lustre on the body of which he was so many years the honoured leader', it cast perhaps a greater shadow.³³ When President the vast majority of appeals, correspondence, and memorials, whether from persecuted Jews, foreign dignitaries, or government officials, were addressed to him personally, making little or no mention of the Board. After he had retired there was a notable fall-off in aid applications, though Montefiore continued to receive many in a private capacity.³⁴ Montefiore was virtually an institution in himself, and one rivalling the Board. He often acted independently;

²⁸ *JC*, 18 July 1862, 4. ²⁹ *Ibid.* 3 July 1868, 4.

³⁰ See LMA, ACC/3121/A/009–10, MBBD, 1859–64, ix, and 1864–71, x.

³¹ LMA, ACC/3121/A/011, MBBD, 1871–8, xi. 338.

³² *JC*, 16 Feb. 1877, 5.

³³ LMA, ACC/3121/A/011, MBBD, 1871–8, xi. 338.

³⁴ This decline might also have been influenced by the increasing stature of the Anglo-Jewish Association; see section IV.

in 1866, for example, he organized, through the Foreign Office, a petition to the Shah of Persia on behalf of oppressed Jews. Despite, in his words, the Board's 'deep interest' and previous involvement in this sphere, the first it knew of this endeavour was upon reception of Montefiore's rather self-aggrandizing note: 'By the blessing of Divine Providence, my petition to his Majesty the Shah of Persia on behalf of our brethren, his subjects, resident in his dominions (in compliance with their memorial to me), has been crowned with success.'³⁵ The interaction between Montefiore and the Deputies was far from that of equals. Montefiore was perfectly capable of operating without the Board. His many missions abroad in relief of persecuted Jews, whilst often ostensibly undertaken in the Board's name, were all initialized and bankrolled by himself. The Board's role was merely to rubber-stamp their sanction, retrospectively, onto whatever venture Montefiore had arranged. At best they acted as a form of personal travel agent for him, obtaining letters of introduction from the government and arranging stages of his journey. Whilst it garnered vicarious achievement from these missions, the Board was in reality devalued, its superfluity being revealed.

The *JC*, commenting in general upon the Board's foreign affairs, concluded that 'In fact it was not the Board but its venerable President who acted, or at least gave impulse to action. The Board simply played the part of *la chambre introuvable*.'³⁶ Less flattering assessments were made. Nemo, the communal commentator, contrasting the Deputies' sporadic intervention abroad with their consistent support of Montefiore's actions, accused them of having 'no objection to dance and dance merrily, if Sir Moses pay the piper'.³⁷ This reliance upon Montefiore's initiative was symptomatic of a wider difficulty the Board suffered due to continued intimacy with its great man. Montefiore seldom attended the Board in the post-emancipation decades yet he remained centrally involved in policy and practice. This situation severely retarded Board operations. As Israel Finestein states: 'By holding onto office he marred the growth of new cadres of leadership and delayed the development of adequate communal machinery for the expanding, multi-faceted and increasingly diversified community.'³⁸ Much communal talent was in this manner, no doubt, lost to the Board, as it locked itself into Montefiore's perceptions and ensured

³⁵ LMA, ACC/3121/A/010, MBBD, 1864-71, x, 110.

³⁶ *JC*, 13 Apr. 1877, 9.

³⁷ *Ibid.* 22 Sept. 1871, 9.

³⁸ Finestein, 'Uneasy Victorian', 230-1.

their continuation through presidential succession. As a result, the Board maintained several anachronistic positions for the majority of the period. It is notable, for instance, that only in 1883 were serious steps taken to enlarge the representation of the Board, and that only in 1885, after Montefiore's death, was an accommodation reached allowing Reform Deputies to sit; despite communal pressure for both objectives pre-dating emancipation.

Unrepresentative and overshadowed by its former President, the Board was far from an efficient, modern organization in the post-emancipation decades, an impression compounded by the lax attendance record of many Deputies. Despite the organization having on average less than ten meetings a year for most of the period, the average number of Deputies attending sessions was less than half the number sitting. The individual attendance figures in Appendix 3 reveal that it was not just the Rothschilds who avoided the assembly. Deputies such as Charles Mosely for Liverpool (Old), Philip Salomons for New Synagogue, Rueben Sassoon for Coventry, Jonah Jonas for Canterbury, or Lewis Davis for Southampton had exceptionally poor records. Although the worst attendees, the majority of their colleagues seldom performed significantly better, and their absenteeism diminished the organization's credibility. 'I venture to think', wrote the pseudonymous Felix Barbel in the July 1872 *JC*,

that if at least twenty out of the forty deputies who constitute the Board—many of whom are shrewd and experienced men—would attend to their duties in a more efficient manner, or resign their positions and allow others to occupy them, the exhibition of a deputy attending a Board meeting once in three years would no longer be witnessed.³⁹

Counterbalancing this somewhat were a not inconsiderable number of Deputies with distinguished records, among them several notable individuals from the older synagogues, including Joseph Montefiore and Joseph Sebag of Bevis Marks, Henry Solomon at New, and David Lindo Alexander for Central, who all attended on average over twenty meetings per session throughout their careers. Special mention must be made of Solomon Schloss and Henry Harris as the two most diligent Deputies, both attending virtually every meeting called during their tenure. These active 'boardocrats' also featured prominently on the various committees the Deputies appointed. Two permanent committees existed in this

³⁹ *JC*, 26 July 1872, 235.

period: the Law, Parliamentary, and General Purposes Committee (LPC), formed in 1854 to report on legislation and offer legal advice, and the Conjoint Foreign Committee (CFC), formed in connection with the AJA in 1878 to oversee communal foreign affairs. These bodies considerably professionalized the Board's work: speeding up analysis of issues and streamlining the decision-making process, they went some way toward mitigating the generally relaxed stance of the institution.

At the root of the Board's amateur administration lay its finances. These were poorly structured. The Board had no reserves of its own and no guaranteed method of raising cash, facts that severely curtailed its capabilities. As the Anglo-Jewish community was a voluntary association the Board had no authority to impose taxes upon it. The 1882 report of the financial subcommittee realized:

No rating power over the seatholders or over the electors of Deputies could be acquired without the aid of an Act of Parliament unless each congregation would adopt a code of laws which should include a power of assessment and have the same enrolled under the provisions of the friendly societies' Acts [but] it would be quite impracticable to induce them all to do this [and] an Act of Parliament would probably be considered out of the question.⁴⁰

The Board was therefore restricted to collecting subscriptions, effectively donations, from participating congregations. Its mode of doing so was quite inefficient. Every six months the institution's expenses were totalled and then divided in equal proportion according to the number of deputies serving. An individual deputy thus cost every congregation the same amount. There were a number of disadvantages to this system. For one, the cost of electing a deputy might fluctuate widely, even during sessions, and was impossible to predict beforehand. For instance, during the April–September 1874 period the Board expended £192 5s. 6d. and the cost per deputy was £5 1s. 2d., whereas in November–April 1886–7 the board spent £152 0s. 1d. at a price of £3 9s. 9d. a deputy.⁴¹ Secondly, it made no provision for the size of congregations or their financial circumstances. This could lead to considerable inequities. In 1882 the eleven-member Coventry congregation was invoiced the same sum of £8 11s. 7d., as was the prosperous Birmingham congregation of 418 members.⁴² Smaller, usually provincial, congregations could not

⁴⁰ LMA, ACC/3121/A/012, MBBD, 1878–89, xii. 202.

⁴¹ LMA, ACC/3121/A/011, MBBD, 1871–8, xi. 41, and LMA, ACC/3121/G1/01/002, BDAR, 1880–9, Apr. 1887, 25.

⁴² *JC*, 28 July 1882, 4.

cope with this expense and some routinely went into arrears, forfeiting their representation. In 1883 the Board reorganized its financial system in an attempt to accommodate the less wealthy, introducing a capitation allowance that levied a flat fee of two shillings per renter on all congregations with less than one hundred but more than ten male seat-renters.⁴³

A third monetary problem, which continued despite this alteration, was the lack of independent funds. This was particularly restrictive for the Board, which constantly sought to restrain expenditure so as not to overburden the synagogues. The *JC* often inveighed against this: 'An authority without pecuniary resources of its own will never rise to be a power, but will always have to content itself with remaining purely a dignity.'⁴⁴ The Board sought to rectify the weakness in 1883 by creating a standing fund to receive 'donations, legacies, and other gifts', but lack of revenue remained a major debility throughout the post-emancipation decades.⁴⁵ It forced the Deputies, whenever substantial sums were needed, to appeal to the community. These fund-raising efforts could realize considerable amounts, as Anglo-Jewry was exceedingly generous: a Morocco Relief Fund generated over £14,000 by 1863, and a similar effort for Persia reached nearly £19,000 in 1872.⁴⁶ But they suffered from the haphazard style that plagued the rest of the Board's monetary policy. There was no possibility of ascertaining the amount that might be obtained, no way of quickly raising money (a crucial factor when seeking to relieve emergencies), no scope for addressing small-scale needs unworthy of a community-wide appeal, and no opportunity to extend assistance beyond crisis management to promote long-term amelioration. Most seriously, they became less effective as time passed, fresh crises arose, and communal care fatigue set in. Montefiore had exclaimed misgivings since 1848 about the difficulty of rousing 'our brethren in England on the subject of foreign sufferings'.⁴⁷ By the 1870s the Board was carefully selecting the issues it presented to the community. Increasingly appeals had to be reissued

⁴³ LMA, ACC/3121/G1/01/002, BDAR, 1880–9, Apr. 1883, 11.

⁴⁴ *JC*, 6 July 1877, 9.

⁴⁵ LMA, ACC/3121/G1/01/002, BDAR, 1880–9, Apr. 1883, 13.

⁴⁶ Emanuel, *Century*, 79, 95.

⁴⁷ University of Southampton Library MS 259, Copies of Papers of Sir Moses Montefiore, 1793–1885, Letter from Montefiore to Louis Loewe, June 1848. The raising of such communal funds was probably the function that Montefiore most depended upon the organization to perform and one that he could not have accomplished individually.

or regrets offered to the sufferers due to the 'feeble response' to a collection.⁴⁸

In spite of its organizational flaws the Board functioned. It maintained relevance in, if not exactly keeping pace with, a developing society and was recognized within the community and without as a legitimate governing interest. Many of its faults might be excused as attributable to the nature of the beast: a non-professional, Victorian interest group could not be expected to set the most sedulous or expert of standards. But what nature of institution was the Board? Of the six types of voluntary association described by B. Lewis, the Deputies correspond most exactly with a religious society, being concerned with promoting a denominational identity.⁴⁹ It differed from other such societies, however, in a number of ways. For instance, the Dissenting Deputies, the loose model for the Board, by the middle of the nineteenth century concentrated almost exclusively upon dispensing legal advice to members.⁵⁰ The Board's scope was greater. It was also a pressure group, operating upon municipal and national levels, and in this respect more akin to trade unions or political interest groups, such as the Liberation Society or the Social Science Association. But in the majority of their functions these organizations were also very different from the Board. Trade unions dealt primarily with economic questions arising from class issues, whereas the Board superintended all aspects of a cross-class minority; political interest groups through varying levels of proactive agitation sought to inform popular opinion and generate political change on a wide range of issues, whereas the Board reacted only to defend Jewish interests, avoiding agitation and with no long-term agenda.⁵¹ Unlike any other voluntary association at this time the Board was also invested with official jurisdiction over its area and used this to pursue members' interests inside as well as outside its constituency. In

⁴⁸ LMA, ACC/3121/A/012 MBBB, 1878–89, xii. 48.

⁴⁹ B. Lewis, *The Middlemost and the Mill Towns: Bourgeois Culture and Politics in Early Industrial England* (Stanford, Calif., 2001), 249. The five other types of voluntary association Lewis identifies are: those promoting political cohesion; coercive or patriotic ones; local political societies or pressure groups; charitable; and cultural.

⁵⁰ D. Bebbington, *The Nonconformist Conscience: Chapel and Politics, 1870–1914* (London, 1982), 19.

⁵¹ H. Pelling, *A History of British Trade Unionism*, 5th edn. (London, 1992), 7; L. Goldman, *Science, Reform, and Politics in Victorian Britain: The Social Science Association, 1857–1886* (Cambridge, 2002), 1–2, 61; D. Thompson, 'The Liberation Society, 1844–1868', in P. Hollis (ed.), *Pressure from Without in Early Victorian England* (London, 1974), 210.

this respect it bore more similitude to structures of corporate Jewish governance upon the Continent, where certain leaders were granted self-governing authority by their respective polity and often utilized this power to enforce internal social and religious discipline. But again, the comparison is only partial. Traditional Jewish communal authority was localized, and within a country there would exist numerous centres of power autonomously pursuing different courses—in Britain, the Board operated on a nationwide scale and sought to restrict independent action from other sources. Seeking to represent Anglo-Jewry to majority society through one medium and, therefore, in one voice, it also engaged in regulating the type of community it believed the modern minority should be, occasionally resorting to social control. The post-emancipation Board was a singular institution, as regards both its English and Jewish status.

III

The Board of Deputies was formed to represent and protect the particular civil interests of the Anglo-Jewish minority in Britain, to be an agent of the community in its relations to the state. What role could such an institution play post-emancipation? In a world where Jews were legally equal citizens, differentiated from their fellow Englishmen merely by denomination, was this partisan body necessary? Certainly, in the years immediately after 1858, the Board had little work during Britain's 'age of equipoise'.⁵² In 1865, the *JC*, noting that 'in the present temper of the nation, it is not likely that the Legislature will wittingly enact any law calculated to interfere with any Jewish practice', characterized the Deputies as 'the Board *Fainéant*'.⁵³ Whilst the newspaper supported the body's continued existence, if only for tradition's sake, others in the community were less hospitable. 'In the opinion of these . . . the best thing the Board can do is to dissolve itself, and the next best thing is to remain inactive, and thus sink into oblivion.'⁵⁴ Reduction to ceremonial functions or even dissolution might well have been the Board's fate had it not been for the activity of the first Gladstonian ministry. Faced with reforming, modernizing, and

⁵² See W. Burn, *The Age of Equipoise: A Study of the Mid-Victorian Generation* (Aldershot, 1994).

⁵³ *JC*, 28 Apr. 1865, 4.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

interfering legislation, the Jews became starkly aware again that despite the hopes of emancipation their differences were still problematic.

Laws made to suit the habits, the belief, and the arrangements of millions of Christians—laws tacitly organised with a sole view to the governmental ideas, settled customs, and determinate practices of the Christian people—require, indeed, special handling when it is desired to preserve the Jews from unintentional hardships and obstacles necessarily proceeding from such laws, and likely to act unduly on a section of citizens whose habits, practices, and observances are diametrically different from those of the majority of their fellow-citizens—a majority who differ, it may be widely, among themselves; but never so widely but their broadest margin of divergence is but a narrow strip of demarcation as compared with the great extent of separation between them and the Jews.⁵⁵

With Jewish exceptionalism again on the agenda, the Board's domestic *raison d'être*, mediating between minority and majority cultures, became of paramount importance. The Deputies were careful, though, to restrict their sphere of responsibility. Involvement with the rights of the individual Jewish citizen was to be avoided; only causes affecting Jews as a minority were to be taken up. As Lewis Emanuel, the Board's secretary and solicitor, explained:

If a man suffers a wrong *as* a Jew, or *because* he is a Jew, or in *respects* of his Judaic faith or observances, the Board is always ready to interpose for his protection, but, excepting in such cases, I take it that a Jewish citizen, whose rights are attacked, must, like a citizen of any other denomination, seek redress through the ordinary tribunals of the country.⁵⁶

The Board sought to protect the Jews' newly won equality without compromising their faith or impinging upon their civil integration. Its efforts in this direction were not confined solely to scrutinizing legislation but covered a range of tasks designed to smooth the interaction of Jews and other Englishmen. These domestic undertakings can be grouped into four main areas of activity: presentation of addresses; anti-defamation work; measures to protect Jewish equality; and regulation of Jewish marriage.

The sending of a loyal address to King George III had been the stimulus behind the Board's formation in 1760. Since then 'the records of the Deputies present a series of addresses of congratulation and condolence to the reigning sovereigns of Great Britain on their accession

⁵⁵ Ibid. 28 Apr. 1871, 6.

⁵⁶ Ibid. 22 Feb. 1878, 5. Emphasis in original.

to the throne, and on every auspicious and inauspicious event that happened in their lives'.⁵⁷ Post-emancipation this 'routine, but by no means barren' function was still an essential aspect of Board work.⁵⁸ A great number of addresses were transmitted to a diverse range of personages in this era, each of which, alongside any reply, was carefully noted in the minutes and annual reports. The purpose of these presentations was manifold. On the most rudimentary level they operated as a means of conveying gratitude. Many British officials indulged Board desires or assisted distressed Jews, and an expression of thanks would probably have been expected. It was also a useful way of praising their actions, flattering their egos, and, thereby, storing up future goodwill. Ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Porte Austin Layard was 'deeply grateful' in 1879 when he received the Deputies' address lauding his efforts for Jewish refugees in the Russo-Turkish War.

It has been my most earnest wish and endeavour to do the utmost in my power to relieve the distress and sufferings of the unfortunate Jews . . . You may assure the Board that I shall always be ready to exercise what little influence I may possess for the protection and defence of the Jews who may need help.⁵⁹

Beyond this practicality, the Board's addresses also served a useful function of identity statement and reinforcement. Every Jewish achievement was marked and every individual advancement fêted by a Board testimonial. Upon his appointment as Solicitor General, Jessel was informed 'That in the elevation of a coreligionist to this high legal office in her Majesty's Government which has been for the first time attained by a Jew the Board recognises a happy and signal proof of the progress of the principles of religious toleration and equality'.⁶⁰ Such addresses served to remind the recently included minority of their continuing success. It was a form of self-celebration and a fillip to communal confidence.

This confidence was apparent in the regular number of addresses sent to foreign governments with no connection to Jews or Jewish causes. The visits of Don Pedro, Emperor of Brazil, and the Sultan of Zanzibar elicited messages of welcome. The deaths of US Presidents Lincoln and Grant saw condolences expressed to the American government.⁶¹ The Deputies evidently considered it appropriate to Anglo-Jewry's status

⁵⁷ *JC*, 28 Nov. 1873, 579.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.* 22 Apr. 1859, 4.

⁵⁹ LMA, ACC/3121/G1/01/002, BDAR, 1880–9, Apr. 1880, 34–5.

⁶⁰ LMA, ACC/3121/A/011, MBBB, 1871–8, xi, 41.

⁶¹ *Ibid.* 28, 347, and LMA, ACC/3121/A/010, MBBB, 1864–71, x, 92.

to issue such missives, just as many other British corporations would have done. It was a sign of their growing sense of importance, the most notable instance of which was the 1872 journey of Montefiore to present Tsar Alexander II with the Board's congratulations upon the 200th anniversary of Peter the Great's rule. This initially generated considerable dissension within the community, where many thought it 'an event which was in no way whatever associated with the fortunes of Israel (except unpleasantly, seeing that Peter the Great was by *no means* a friend of the Jews)'.⁶² But the mission was a triumph. According to Montefiore's recollection, the Tsar suspended his summer military manoeuvres and travelled back to the Winter Palace 'expressly to spare me fatigue, in consequence of my advanced age . . . I am at a loss for words in which adequately to describe the gracious sentiments which his Imperial Majesty, and the members of his government, evinced towards me.'⁶³ No other Jewish community could boast of such international recognition. At home, too, these memorials achieved notable success, culminating in 1887, when Anglo-Jewry received 'a signal mark of Royal favour', being one of the 'very few selected from a vast number of public bodies' to personally present their jubilee address to Queen Victoria.⁶⁴ Having used addresses to demonstrate its loyalty for several centuries, the Board in the post-emancipation period obtained through them a remarkable indication of Jewish acceptance.

A corollary of this self-promotion effort was the Board's defence of the Jewish reputation. Comparatively tolerant as Britain was, cases of anti-Jewish calumny still occurred. The Board usually took responsibility for refuting such bigotry. The earliest case recorded in the Board minutes, post-emancipation, was an 1861 exchange with *Chambers' Journal*, which had published an article intimating the accuracy of blood libel accusations. An initial complaint from the Board was unsuccessful and legal opinion was sought, but a visit from Alderman Philips to the editors achieved the requisite apology: 'whatever may have been the currents of popular prejudice regarding the Jews (to all of which *we* are heartily opposed) we cannot but feel sorry that the history in question was introduced into *Chambers' Journal*.'⁶⁵ A similar incident,

⁶² *JC*, 19 July 1872, 224. Emphasis in original.

⁶³ LMA, ACC/3121/A/010, MBBD, 1864–71, x. 105.

⁶⁴ LMA, ACC/3121/G1/01/002, BDAR, 1880–9, Apr. 1888, 4. The idea for this address originated at the Board but its preparation and presentation involved a cross-section of the community.

⁶⁵ LMA, ACC/3121/A/009, MBBD, 1859–64, ix. 179. Italics in original.

this time concerning *The Globe* newspaper, took place in 1880. Again, the subject was the veracity of blood libel, and again, after a consultation with Joseph Sebag this time, the paper published an apology upon learning of Jewish offence.⁶⁶ The Board tackled such prejudice with conviction and was not afraid to remonstrate with British authority figures, if required, as happened in December 1884, when Mr Justice Kay, pronouncing judgement in the case of *Jackson v. Harris*, made observations that ‘fastened on the entire Jewish race the odium of usury’.⁶⁷ In what the *JC* termed a ‘dignified vindication’ of communal honour the Deputies wrote strongly in complaint:

The Board fails to understand how the learned Judge could consider it, at the present day, either just or necessary to draw an invidious distinction between Gentile and Jew, and to impute evil practices to an entire community, or on what principle the race or religion of the defendants could be regarded as a matter relevant to the question.⁶⁸

Clearly the Board believed it had right upon its side, that in the civil society of Britain such sentiments would not generally be countenanced. The paucity of defamatory incidents in this period, when Jews were first entering every aspect of the Gentile world, would seem to justify their confidence,⁶⁹ and indicate the continuance of a generally tolerant attitude towards the community—despite the growth of antipathy in certain sections of elite and press opinion from the late 1870s sparked by the Bulgarian Agitation, as mentioned in the last chapter, which historians such as David Feldman highlight to suggest a negative shift in Britons’ approach to Jews.⁷⁰

Underlying Board assurance, however, was a considerable Jewish insecurity regarding their inclusion. The Deputies were uneasy about dealing with some anti-Jewish events, and increasingly so as European anti-Semitism began to intensify noticeably over the 1880s. The April–May 1884 outbreak of anti-Jewish violence at Limerick

⁶⁶ LMA, ACC/3121/G1/01/002, BDAR, 1880–9, Apr. 1881, 22.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, Apr. 1885, 22. ⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 22, and *JC*, 9 Jan. 1885, 17.

⁶⁹ Besides the above-mentioned episodes the Board reports record one more example of a bigoted judge, this time in Middlesbrough, Mar. 1881: see LMA, ACC/3121/G1/01/002, BDAR, 1880–9, Apr. 1881, 28–32. There were also several isolated occasions when individual Deputies wrote to *The Times* refuting prejudicial comments made by some other correspondents, see *The Times*, 12 Nov. 1864, 5, and 2 Nov. 1870, 10.

⁷⁰ D. Feldman, *Englishmen and Jews: Social Relations and Political Culture, 1840–1914* (London, 1994), 120.

revealed these contradictions in the Deputies' attitude to Jewish defence. Whilst the ringleaders were prosecuted and imprisoned, the Board admitted that 'the actual cause of the attack upon the Jews appeared to be involved in a certain amount of mystery'.⁷¹ A proposal was therefore made to appoint a deputy to enquire into the matter, presumably with a view to preventing any recurrence. This was defeated by eleven votes to eight,⁷² a result justified in the subsequent report by the assertion that the Board 'after much deliberation, considered it wiser to allow the agitation quickly to subside rather than give it an exaggerated importance by taking measures'.⁷³ Unable to effect a solution through correspondence or a gentlemanly conversation, the Board preferred to remain quiet, leaving the British press to exhibit its sympathies and the proper authorities to take active measures.

The *JC* had long castigated such circumspection in the face of Jewish need, often criticizing how 'the badge of sufferance of our tribe is needlessly paraded by . . . leading members, who seem to imagine that the more Jews, and their needs, requirements, and just claims are kept in the background the better'.⁷⁴ The Board of Deputies, more careful in its assertion of Jewishness, had perhaps the more realistic approach. When O. J. Simon, son of MP John Simon, took *The Spectator* to task for some indelicate remarks it had published in an otherwise complimentary article on Montefiore's 99th birthday, the periodical responded with a more explicit anti-Jewish harangue.⁷⁵ An article entitled 'Jewish Sensitiveness' denied any prejudice against Montefiore and claimed the journal had always supported Jews' emancipation, if only to more quickly cure 'their tribal exclusiveness'. Proceeding to indulge in several derogatory comments about Judaism, its 'partly meaningless ritual' and 'want of sincerity', *The Spectator* concluded: 'the truth is that Jews have now risen so high in Europe that like Americans before their great war, they are sensitively alive to any mention which implies they are separate from other nations; but why not accept this separateness.'⁷⁶ Discretion, then, might have been wiser in such circumstances, where protest merely prompted further slur. This was obviously a grey area in

⁷¹ LMA, ACC/3121/A/012, MBBD, 1878–89, xii. 282.

⁷² *Ibid.* 283.

⁷³ LMA, ACC/3121/A/012, BDAR, 1880–9, Apr. 1886, 32.

⁷⁴ *JC*, 1 Aug. 1873, 300.

⁷⁵ *The Spectator*, 3 Nov. 1883, 1409. Simon's objections were to the description of Montefiore as a 'Jew philanthropist', the over-exaggeration of his wealth, and the comparison of his health with a pauper centenarian's in the article's conclusion.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.* 1407–9.

English opinion, which would not condone overt intolerance but was still widely suffused with negative perceptions of the Jew as 'other'. The Board walked a fine line with its anti-defamation work. It realized that even as emancipated Jews the community could not aggressively assert itself, and whilst manifest prejudice might be rigorously upbraided, more insidious statements had to be overlooked.

The primary task of the post-emancipation Board of Deputies in Britain remained as it had been during emancipation: ensuring the religious equality of Jews and Judaism. The institution understood this to mean asserting Anglo-Jewry's right to equality of socio-economic opportunity without compromising the tenets or practices of Judaism—the Jewish ideal of emancipation. Its role as interlocutor between the country and the community witnessed the Board attempt to overcome various factors that threatened to upset either side of this balance. In practice this entailed keeping a close watch upon legislation and negotiating with relevant authorities to resolve any friction. The LPC considered any parliamentary Bills that might affect the community. The vast majority required no action. In some cases, where the principle did not directly involve Jewish interests, the Board merely notified relevant communal organizations, as it did with an 1859 Bill abolishing general exemption from local rates, which it forwarded to all Jewish charities and schools.⁷⁷ For others, where minority rights were central, the Board took responsibility for securing necessary alterations. In 1869–70, for instance, it drew up several petitions pressing the passage of the University Tests Bill.⁷⁸

Such activity frequently overlapped with the work certain Jewish MPs undertook for their coreligionists. Often striving for the same goal, an informal and ad hoc relationship existed between the two groups. Typically, this saw the Board apply to Jewish MPs requesting their intervention with a Bill's promoter or their oversight of a particular clause. Jewish MPs were usually amenable to this type of low-key assistance. After the Board secretary had an interview with Jessel and Simon concerning the community's needs vis-à-vis the 1870 Factory legislation, the former discussed Jewish requirements with the Home Secretary, whilst the latter agreed to suggest a clause during committee.⁷⁹

The Board occupied the subordinate role in this cooperation. It served as a prompt, suggesting action and bringing cases before the MPs, upon

⁷⁷ LMA, ACC/3121/A/009, MBBD, 1859–64, ix, 19.

⁷⁸ LMA, ACC/3121/A/010, MBBD, 1864–71, x, 272, 348.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.* 368.

whom it was entirely reliant for action. The MPs never approached the Deputies. Not infrequently they operated independently and achieved alone what the Board had sought to attain in tandem. The conscience clause Simon moved in the Ballot Act Amendment Act was done 'without communicating with the Board', despite the institution having 'simultaneously taken action' in this direction.⁸⁰ If the MPs declined to help, the Board had little option but to drop an issue. The Deputies deemed it 'injudicious' to pursue special Jewish provisions in the 1869 Endowed Schools Act as 'Mr. Jessel had written to state that in his opinion it was not desirable to press for the insertion of the clauses suggested, and that other Jewish Members of Parliament with whom he had consulted were of the same opinion.'⁸¹

The Board's most frequent efforts were not, though, concerned with legislation. As an independent organization the Board could adopt a wider scope of action than the MPs, and as a partisan body might less controversially interfere in a broader range of Jewish issues, to which it could also devote its full attention. The Board's work for Jewish equality inhabited a more day-to-day, practical level than that of the busier, Jewish parliamentarians. The Deputies dealt with the complications of being Jewish in modern Britain as they occurred, seeking to settle the community within its non-Jewish environment. In 1876, Ascher Green of Tower Hamlets complained of the hardship of serving on a coroner's jury over the Sabbath. The Board, personally interviewing the respective coroner, obtained his 'most happy' assurance to indulge the 'conscientious scruples of Jewish jurymen' if provided with formal notification.⁸² During the general election of March 1880 the polling in three boroughs—Marylebone, Southwark, and Chelsea—fell upon the seventh day of Passover, thereby preventing Jews voting. The Deputies waited upon the returning officers of each district, requesting alteration to obviate this disability. In each case, the poll was moved a day forward to accommodate Jewish qualms; in Marylebone, where cards and posters had already been printed, this entailed considerable trouble for electoral staff.⁸³

The Board did not merely react when complaints reached it or situations arose but would proactively seek to adjust possible areas of

⁸⁰ LMA, ACC/3121/A/012, MBBD, 1878–89, xii. 234.

⁸¹ LMA, ACC/3121/A/010, MBBD, 1864–71, x. 292, and *JC*, 9 July 1869, 9.

⁸² LMA, ACC/3121/A/011, MBBD, 1871–8, xi. 400, 411.

⁸³ *JC*, 26 Mar. 1880, 13, and LMA, ACC/3121/A/012, MBBD, 1878–89, xii. 81. The Board did have to bear the cost of this alteration, amounting to £15 7s. 6d.

contention. Although none had lobbied the Board for assistance, over 1883–4 Deputies engaged in correspondence with the War Office to acquire a furlough for Jewish soldiers during Passover. Once this had been granted, they pressed for the privilege to be extended to all Jewish festivals—a total of twenty-one days' exceptional holiday. 'Whilst the Board feels that it is making a very large demand upon the generosity of the military authorities, it ventures to believe that if the proposed concession were granted, it would stimulate the men enjoying its benefits to increased zeal and assiduity in the discharge of their duties.'⁸⁴ Such particularist requests were directed not just at state bodies but private institutions, as well. The Board successfully appealed to the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford in 1883 and 1885 respectively, to organize alternative local examinations if the originals took place on the Sabbath.⁸⁵

These allowances seemed to buoy British Jews in the early 1880s. Continuing to demonstrate the largely unproblematic nature of minority existence in British society, the concessions to Jewish particularity gained, with little difficulty, from public and private authorities reinforced Anglo-Jewry's belief in English beneficence and the efficacy of emancipation. Reviewing the disturbing state of continental anti-Semitism in September 1883, the *JC* looked to such accommodation for reassurance: 'It is with a feeling of satisfaction and pride that we turn from these gloomy records abroad to the unruffled prosperity of Judaism in England. Here on all sides we see both steady and solid progress . . . and increase of happy relations with our neighbours.'⁸⁶ Not all of the Board's efforts were so easily effected. It required three years, a Home Office recommendation, repeated communication with prison governors, and an investigation from the justices of Surrey in Quarter Sessions, before Jewish prisoners in Wandsworth were granted the privilege of rest on religious festivals.⁸⁷ Once moral appeal had been exhausted the Board had little power to influence the situation. It was, like most Jewish organizations in this period, reliant upon Gentile goodwill.

It is striking how small scale and essentially limited were the Board's activities in this area—its principal justification for arrogating communal authority. None of the above issues was urgent or particularly onerous. Such problems did not occur with great regularity and the

⁸⁴ *JC*, 31 Oct. 1884, 12. This request was granted.

⁸⁵ LMA, ACC/3121/G1/01/002, BDAR, 1880–9, Apr. 1884, 16, and Apr. 1886, 23.

⁸⁶ *JC*, 28 Sept. 1883, 10.

⁸⁷ LMA, ACC/3121/A/011, MBBD, 1871–8, xi. 133, 393.

majority were quickly resolved. The number of Jews affected was small. In 1883 only three soldiers needing facilities to observe Passover could be located in garrison towns.⁸⁸ Despite countrywide advertising in 1887, the Deputies reported ‘regrets that a larger number of the community did not avail themselves of the special provision made by the committees who superintended the Oxford and Cambridge local examinations’.⁸⁹ A meagre seven Jews had applied for the special provision. Such activity was, it would therefore seem, rather negligible to the majority of the community. It could probably also have been accomplished by individual Jewish leaders or other institutions, such as the Jewish Board of Guardians or United Synagogue, both of which cooperated with the Board in certain of these projects. In this situation it was not surprising that calls for the Board’s dissolution were entertained. To many Jews, a body claiming representation of the entire community whilst pursuing a line highlighting the exceptional Jewish presence in society—and on a rather petty level at that—would have contradicted their understanding of emancipation. This was relatively harmless, indeed, doubtless beneficial to some, when concerned with providing a choice for pious Jews that otherwise might have compromised their faith or restricted their civil existence. Jewish soldiers and prisoners, for instance, gained the option to observe festivals if they desired to or continue as before, alongside everybody else. But on occasions the Board asserted its principles at the expense of individual Jews. In 1873, concerned over the possibility of Jewish children being subjected to Christian regimes in privately run industrial schools, the Board negotiated that

Jewish children hereafter committed to any other industrial school throughout the Kingdom will be immediately transferred to the Gem St. School, where they will have the advantages of regular visitation and instruction from Ministers of the Birmingham Hebrew congregations and they will be exempt from a course of discipline repugnant to their religion.⁹⁰

At this point there was not ‘a single Jewish inmate in any of the institutions’, but within a year a Jewish girl was remanded in Leeds and duly transported to Birmingham.⁹¹ It is to be wondered whether

⁸⁸ LMA, ACC/3121/A/012, MBBD, 1878–89, xii. 233.

⁸⁹ LMA, ACC/3121/G1/01/002, BDAR, 1880–9, Apr. 1887, 19–20.

⁹⁰ LMA, ACC/3121/A/011, MBBD, 1871–8, xi. 133. This school was located in Birmingham as the Board was unable, after ‘considerable difficulties’, to reach agreement with any London ones. Industrial schools were used to discipline and educate juvenile offenders.

⁹¹ *Ibid.* 90, 215.

it was truly in the interests of a troubled young girl to be transferred from her home, presumably away from her relations and friends, and placed in an unfamiliar environment under a special regimen that often separated her from fellow inmates, merely so that the Board was assured her religious scruples were not violated.

One issue dominated these Board attempts to arbitrate the Jewish and English spheres of existence in this period: factory legislation. Significantly, the first area where Jewish MPs sought special treatment for Jews, the raft of Bills and Acts seeking to regulate the working conditions of women and children, also caused the Deputies greater trouble than any other. At first, the Board was not particularly agitated. Having obtained a sympathetic clause in the original 1867 Act, it was reluctant to further press the matter.⁹² After Morris Oppenheim, a barrister, communal worker, and Deputy for Manchester (Old) at this time, called attention to the recent conviction of members of seven Jewish firms for infringing the Act, the Board, with its characteristic patrician sense of responsibility, resolved to seek 'whenever possible' a relieving amendment.⁹³ The Deputies were far more reluctant to pressure the state for this indulgence than the above ones. Even they shied at introducing an exclusively Jewish measure into the national assembly, being content to wait to amend any future Bill introduced. Again, the *JC* was bullish:

We are well aware that we are treading on delicate ground, and that the governing classes in the community touch upon matters of this kind very reluctantly. They are fearful of giving offence to their neighbours, by claiming what might be deemed special privileges. But we contend that in entertaining this apprehension they wholly misunderstood the English character.⁹⁴

The Board's hesitancy was justified, though. When an LPC deputation waited upon the Home Secretary in January 1870, Mr Bruce praised their patience: 'he thought the Board acted wisely in not asking for a special Act of Parliament, as the introduction of such a measure might very likely lead to misconception in some quarters.'⁹⁵

⁹² LMA, ACC/3121/A/010, MBBD, 1864–71. 148–9. In this instance the promoters of the Bill agreed to insert the Board's desired clause, which allowed Jewish workshops closed on the Sabbath to open afterwards till 9 p.m. on Saturdays. For large parts of the year, though, this proved worthless, Jewish workers being reluctant to work for the 1–2 hours available.

⁹³ *Ibid.* 275, 281. ⁹⁴ *JC*, 26 Feb. 1869, 4.

⁹⁵ LMA, ACC/3121/A/010, MBBD, 1864–71, x. 347.

This deputation was a symptom, however, of changing attitudes at the Board. Weeks before the Deputies had received a petition from the City of London Jewish Tailors Benefit Society. Signed by 1,815 hands, this begged the Board to strive for amendment 'so that we may number the same hours as our Christian brethren, without infringing on our religious principles'.⁹⁶ Such a direct appeal to the Board's protection could not be ignored, especially as it was noted that no member of these industrial classes actually served on the organization.⁹⁷ An inquiry was immediately instituted, for which considerable effort was undertaken, the President visiting several Jewish factories and interviewing a variety of concerned parties. The conclusions were ominous. There were between 3,000 and 4,000 Jews working in the worst affected trades of tobacco and tailoring: 'their employment was precarious and their wages small . . . they have always, in fact, occupied the lowest stratum of industrial life, many of them being in a chronic state of want; but that since 1867 their condition has been rendered very much worse.'⁹⁸ Admitting their original amendment was not efficacious and Jews consequently lost twice as many working hours as Christians, the report warned: 'Unless these poor fellows can be allowed to work on Sunday instead of Saturday . . . the adoption of handicrafts by the poor of our people will . . . be greatly discouraged, the desecration of the Sabbath will be directly promoted, and the mass poverty in our community will continue to increase.'⁹⁹ These dire possibilities jolted the Board out of its complacency and the Deputies resolved to request special treatment. Able to plead a clear case of discrimination the Board became far more confident. 'To the objection that this would be asking for exceptional legislation for the Jewish community, your committee venture to think that they have established a clear case for exceptional legislation.'¹⁰⁰ This opinion was reinforced by the knowledge that Gentiles enforcing the regulations, from inspectors to magistrates, repeatedly expressed sympathy for convicted Jews; thereby 'tacitly admitting the harsh and oppressive incidence of the Acts'.¹⁰¹ The Deputies' determination was checked somewhat by their meeting with the Home Secretary mentioned above. Bruce would agree only to introduce remedial clauses into the next relevant Bill, leaving the Board again playing its waiting game.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.* 335, 354. ⁹⁷ *JC*, 15 July 1870, 7.

⁹⁸ LMA, ACC/3121/A/010, MBBD, 1864-71, x. 337-8.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.* 337-8.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.* 338-9.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.* 338-9.

This turnaround regarding workshop regulation is the best example of the Board responding to and working for communal needs, rather than its own interpretation of these, in the post-emancipation era. Despite this, its achievements were initially negligible. The first measure of relief came with Salomon's Workshop Regulation Act Amendment, March 1871. The Deputies had urged Salomons to extend the Act to cover all Jewish manufacturers: 'if the principle be a just one as applied to tobacco manufacturers it must be equally so in the case of all factories under the like conditions.'¹⁰² Salomons rejected this logic; rebuffing the Board's aid he brought his limited Bill, correctly confident that only in such circumscribed format would it pass the House. The Board, powerless to influence events once persons of Gentile and Jewish authority had refused its demands, sought nevertheless to procure some kudos, claiming the Act as fruit of its preparatory lobbying.¹⁰³ The Jewish Tailors duly provided this esteem. Sending a memorial of appreciation, the Society stated its belief that in no small measure the Act was 'attained through your countenance and assistance'.¹⁰⁴ Many in the community were less generous. 'The plain truth is, that the Board tried to do something and failed. The Board retired. . . Next year, Sir David Salomons tried to do something and succeeded. The Board then cried "halves",' commented 'Gazebo' in a more accurate appraisal.¹⁰⁵

Salomons's Act only partially alleviated the problem and the Board continued to receive complaints. Increasingly, these came from Jewish factory owners, who, often employing large numbers of Jews, lost considerable working time. The Board remained committed and took the opportunity presented by the 1875 Commission appointed to inquire into the working of the Factory and Workshop Acts to once more represent the Jewish cause. The Board submitted a classic plea founded on religious liberty and its reciprocal benefits to society: a 'concession to persons professing the Jewish religion would be at once an act of justice as between them and their rivals of other denominations, and conducive to public policy and morality by enabling persons to act up to the dictates of their conscience'.¹⁰⁶ The commissioners,

¹⁰² LMA, ACC/3121/A/010, MBBB, 1864–71, x, 407–8.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.* 410.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.* 432. ¹⁰⁵ *JC*, 3 Nov. 1871, 3.

¹⁰⁶ *Parliamentary Reports from Commissioners 1876*, xxix, Report of the Commissioners Appointed to Inquire into the Working of the Factory and Workshop Acts, with a View to their Consolidation and Amendment; Together with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index, 146.

possessing a stricter understanding of legal equality, expressed their hostility to such concepts: 'Special relations of the law in favour of particular classes or individuals are in themselves objectionable. In operation they cause jealousy and dissatisfaction in those to whom they are not granted.'¹⁰⁷ But, recognizing the complexity of the Jews' circumstances, they felt such exceptions could not be dispensed with in this instance.¹⁰⁸ The Board had succeeded—so well, in fact, that when approached by the Master Tailors' Protection Association in June 1885 for further adjustments, the Deputies could reply that 'the Jewish tailors suffered such a trifling disadvantage as compared with non-Jews, that it would not be judicious to apply for special legislation on their behalf'.¹⁰⁹

The other main function of the post-emancipation Board and the most important from a communal perspective was its regulation of Jewish marriage. The 1836 Marriage Act had invested the Board with responsibility for certifying Jewish marriage secretaries. In practice this meant that all synagogues wishing to solemnize marriages had to apply to the Deputies, who required that they obtain a reference from the Chief Rabbi or *Haham* testifying to their Jewish credentials. The Board would then recommend them to the Registrar General, who issued a licence. This system was convenient to both the Jewish and English authorities. It provided the Registrar with a useful means of ensuring that only bona fide synagogues received state sanction, avoiding the possibility of his office having to make complicated enquiries regarding the propriety of certain congregations or being drawn into wrangles over Jewish definition. For as the not infrequent requests he made to the Deputies for an 'authoritative reply' on questions of Jewish usage indicate, the Registrar was, unsurprisingly, quite ignorant regarding Jewish customs.¹¹⁰ The Deputies benefited from the ability to manage the community. Jewish marriage practice could be kept Orthodox, malpractice reprimanded, and wayward synagogues leant on to conform.

The reciprocal advantages of this arrangement occasioned a very congenial working relationship between the Board and the Registrar, as both strove to realize the goal of a well-regulated community adhering

¹⁰⁷ Ibid. 36.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid. 37. These exemptions extended the privilege of the 1871 Act to all Jewish manufacture and also permitted extra weekday overtime for Christians employed by Jews who shut their factories on the Sabbath and Sunday.

¹⁰⁹ LMA, ACC/3121/G1/01/002, BDAR, 1880–9, Apr. 1886, 21.

¹¹⁰ LMA, ACC/3121/A/009, MBBB, 1859–64, ix. 129.

to both English and Jewish law. Operating in tandem they sought to correct any misapplications or irregularities. In July 1864, for instance, the Registrar's office reported a case of marriage celebration in the Hartlepool congregation, which had no certified secretary. The Board duly communicated with the offending synagogue, informing them of the necessary procedures. Three months later the congregation was legally registered.¹¹¹ Generally, though, the English authorities left supervision to the Board and relied heavily upon them to coordinate Jewish registration. The mutually advantageous relationship between the Board of Deputies and the Registrar General not only typified the institution's role as communal medium but in many ways epitomized the emancipatory ideal of Jewish and British interaction, combining respect for Judaism and English legality.

The Board's task of upholding the Jewish side of this arrangement was complicated by the repeated occurrence of irregular forms of marriage. The simplicity of basic Jewish marriage requirements allows unions to be easily solemnized, greatly facilitating the evasion of any official restrictions.¹¹² Across the period, numerous instances of this were recorded. The secretary of the Manchester Hebrew Congregation complained to the Board about 'a case of mock marriage in that city between a foreign Jew and Jewess, the rite being performed by a Polish Jew unauthorised to officiate' in 1868.¹¹³ In December 1869, the Registrar drew attention to similar offences in Hull and Grimsby.¹¹⁴ The *JC* published a harrowing account of forced marriage leading to attempted murder from Sheffield in January 1876.¹¹⁵ All these sources noted that 'irregular marriages are almost confined to Jews of foreign birth' and 'who, being foreigners, have not been sufficiently impressed with that respect for law and order which characterises the English people'.¹¹⁶ They all, also, petitioned the Board to prevent further occurrences. The Board itself was particularly anxious to 'repress the evil'.¹¹⁷ The LPC exhorted action in the strongest terms, warning that if these marriages

are not checked there is nothing to prevent small bodies of Jews, both in London and the provinces, separating themselves from the parent congregation, with

¹¹¹ LMA, ACC/3121/A/010, MBBB, 1864–71, x. 30–1.

¹¹² All that is required for the most basic form of Jewish matrimony is the placing of a ring upon the bride's finger in the presence of two witnesses and a rabbi who recites a Hebrew blessing formula.

¹¹³ LMA, ACC/3121/A/010, MBBB, 1864–71, x. 256.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.* 340.

¹¹⁵ *JC*, 18 Feb. 1876, 747.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, and 28 Jan. 1876, 699.

¹¹⁷ LMA, ACC/3121/A/010, MBBB, 1864–71, x. 253.

self-certified ministers, both ignorant and unprincipled, who could connive at marriages taking place, despite the existence of grave impediments arising from former existing marriages, or from relationships within the degrees prohibited by statute, and that thus scandals might arise tending to the discredit and dishonour of the entire community.¹¹⁸

This was a terrifying possibility for an organization devoted to maintaining an orderly and unified community in harmony with its British environment.

Irregular marriages threatened to undermine all that the Board represented. Exacerbating this were genuine social concerns with such forms of matrimony that could be used to entrap and exploit women and made wife desertion difficult to punish.¹¹⁹ Anglo-Jewry was eager to eradicate the problem. Ironically, previous legislative dispensation for Jewish marriage prevented any recourse to legal action.¹²⁰ 'It is but too evident that that which was probably intended as a beneficial exemption to the Jewish community has generated a very gross abuse.'¹²¹ The Registrar General suggested affixing notices in Jewish areas pointing out the illegal character and consequences of these ceremonies.¹²² Less keen to advertise its embarrassments, the Board declined. Unable to prosecute, the Deputies were forced to rely upon informal pressure to exert their social control, and entrusted local communities with stamping out the menace. The Manchester Board of Guardians, for instance, brought people performing such marriages before local magistrates, hoping that severe punishments would dissuade others.¹²³ By the end of the period, unable to curb the problem and facing a dramatic increase in Jewish immigration, the Board considered it

advisable to endeavour to introduce a clause to the effect that any person who, after the passing of the Act, shall knowingly and wilfully solemnise any marriage

¹¹⁸ LMA, ACC/3121/G1/01/002, BDAR, 1880–9, Apr. 1889, 19.

¹¹⁹ H. Henriques, *Jewish Marriages and the English Law* (London, 1909), 55.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.* 21, 27. This derived from the clause in Hardwicke's 1753 Marriage Act, which recognized the validity of Quaker and Jewish marriage according to their own custom, exempting them from other requirements binding Christians. The 1836 Marriage Act was enabling not disabling, and merely added the registration process to existing marriage forms. Thus, Jews violating registration were still only acting irregularly, rather than illegally. Other types of clandestine marriage, such as those contravening degrees of consanguinity, were outlawed by specific clauses and were illegal to Jews and Christians alike.

¹²¹ LMA, ACC/3121/G1/01/002, BDAR, 1880–9, Apr. 1889, 18.

¹²² LMA, ACC/3121/A/010, MBBB, 1864–71, x, 340.

¹²³ R. Liedtke, *Jewish Welfare in Hamburg and Manchester, c.1850–1914* (Oxford, 1998), 156.

between persons professing the Jewish religion, in the absence of the secretary of the synagogue lawfully authorised to register such marriage shall be guilty of felony.¹²⁴

By February 1889 the LPC had prepared a draft Bill to check irregular Jewish marriage.¹²⁵

Fear of clandestine matrimony coupled with their paradigmatic interaction with British authorities made the Board of Deputies very jealous of its power over Jewish marriage. ‘Vigilant attention’, bordering upon neurosis, was paid to any possible alteration in their control.¹²⁶ The institution was therefore deeply agitated when the 1868 Royal Commission on Marriage proposed to devolve responsibility to individual congregations, removing the Board from the process.¹²⁷ In this step the Commission was following the recommendations of Salomons, the only Jew to appear before it, who gave evidence as a private individual. Talking up the example of Reform Judaism, Salomons argued that the existence of a state-sponsored middleman enforcing a particular code through its certification prerogative ‘promotes discord in a small body by one party being enabled to assume power over the other’ and ‘puts the state in a very anomalous position in having to appear as a party to these religious disputes’.¹²⁸ His proclivity would be much more in tune with the rhetoric of emancipation, of universal treatment over particular privilege. ‘What I want to see is the Jews put on the same footing of religious freedom as all other dissenters, that they shall have perfect liberty from the state, so that, when a congregation is established they shall at once be able to go to the Registrar General and have their society registered.’¹²⁹ The Board preferred a more partisan stance. It and Salomons had always possessed divergent views upon equality and its requirements, variant attitudes that continued after the event. Deeming Salomons’s proposals ‘most unwise and inexpedient’ it pooh-poohed his claims that the community desired greater independence of expression:

those who are best acquainted with the practical workings of the present system, namely the Registrar General, the Jewish Ecclesiastical Authorities, and this

¹²⁴ LMA, ACC/3121/B/02/013, Presidents and Secretaries’ Papers, Charles Emanuel: Report of the LPC on the question of an irregular marriage at Manchester, 17 Apr. 1888.

¹²⁵ LMA, ACC/3121/G1/01/002, BDAR, 1880–9, Apr. 1889, 19.

¹²⁶ LMA, ACC/3121/A/010, MBBB, 1864–71, x. 240.

¹²⁷ *Parliamentary Reports from Commissioners 1867–8*, xxxii, Report of the Royal Commission on the Laws of Marriage, 85.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.* 84.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*

Board, are opposed to change, and, as the great body of Jews entertain the same feeling, it would surely be unwise and impolitic to unsettle a law which deals with the most hallowed relations of life, in order to meet the case of a hypothetical and imaginary schism, which, it is assumed, *might* arise, but of which in reality not the remotest prospect exists.¹³⁰

Naturally for an institution, the Board sought to preserve its power, but it was not exaggerating the broad support for its stance. More synagogues successfully affiliated mid term, outside the constitutionally established election period, on the justification of wishing to prevent any change in marriage regulation than at any other point in this era; the Manchester Hebrew Congregation, for instance, elected two Deputies after an absence of ten years.¹³¹ The Chief Rabbi wrote in complaint to the Commission. The *JC* and the majority of its correspondents were incensed. The initial fear was the emasculation of the organization. The Board's

chief connection with the congregations is owing to the power it has to certify secretaries . . . Take away that power, and nothing would remain but voluntary reasons for its cohesion. There would no longer be any definite object for congregations to send representatives to it, and bear the necessary expenses of the body.¹³²

The demise of the Deputies might not have so perturbed all Jews but the loss of its regulatory responsibilities threatened a more alarming possibility. Although major religious schism was unlikely in the community, as Adler stressed to the Commission, 'experience has taught me, that petty dissensions, altogether unconnected with religious matters, have sometimes arisen in the smaller provincial congregations'.¹³³ Working in concert the Board and Adler had previously managed to soothe most intra-synagogal squabbles and stifle splits by refusing to endorse any new splinter congregations. The Hebrew New Synagogue Leeds, a breakaway from the Leeds Hebrew Congregation, was refused a Board marriage recommendation in 1874, so that Adler might effect reconciliation.¹³⁴ Anachronistically, the Board and Adler coercively used their marriage privileges to maintain communal coherence in an associational age.

¹³⁰ LMA, ACC/3121/A/010, MBBB, 1864–71, x. 250, and National Archives, HO45/8161, Report of the Board of Deputies on Jewish Marriages to the Home Office, 11 Dec. 1868, 3. Emphasis in original.

¹³¹ *JC*, 20 Nov. 1868, 3.

¹³² *Ibid.* 29 Jan. 1869, 4.

¹³³ *Parliamentary Reports from Commissioners 1867–8*, xxxii. 45.

¹³⁴ LMA, ACC/3121/A/011, MBBB, 1871–8, xi. 329.

More effective than social ostracism or financial sanctions, this statutory power was utilized by the Board to enforce not only unity but a communal standard of Judaism. Having excluded Reform premancipation, the Board's main concern was foreign-born 'malcontents', who frequently practised versions of Judaism both more Orthodox and Reformist than Anglo-Jewry.¹³⁵ 'There are some towns in which only 10 foreign Jews reside . . . who might be ignorant both of the laws of the land, and of the laws, customs and usages of the Jews.' At present, as a *JC* correspondent observed, they are compelled to belong to the community 'for the purpose of securing the rights of marriage and burial; whereas, if the recommendation in question be adopted, we should have each of these form a distinct congregation, and adieu to all unity, good order, or authority'.¹³⁶ The majority of the community did not desire Salomons's equality, which in practice would have fractured Jewish fraternity in England. They preferred Jewish partiality. 'It is clear when the law granted the Quakers and the Jews this special exemption . . . it intended to grant them a privilege peculiar to themselves as distinct from the great mass of dissenters,' was the *JC*'s verdict.¹³⁷

The Board of Deputies was supposedly a secular institution. When lobbying the Home Office to maintain their certification responsibility the Deputies stated: 'no ecclesiastic either is or ever has been a member of the Board, the guidance of the community in religious matters is not interfered with by the Board.'¹³⁸ On several occasions when petitioned by congregations to resolve internal quarrels the Board replied it 'could not interfere in matters of difference between the congregation and any of its members or officers'.¹³⁹ Despite lacking any invested authority over communal religiosity the Board evidently did interfere, contradicting its meekly professed non-religious stance. As Salomons told the Marriage Commission, 'they assume to be in the interest of Orthodox ecclesiastical authority' and use marriage certification in 'an attempt to promote Jewish Orthodoxy by the authority of Parliament'.¹⁴⁰ It is hard to refute Salomons's assertion. Clause 6 of

¹³⁵ *JC*, 13 Nov. 1868, 7. Malcontents was the description used by the *JC* correspondent subsequently quoted, not the Board.

¹³⁶ LMA, ACC/3121/A/010, MBBB, 1864–71, x. 127. and *JC*, 13 Nov. 1868, 7.

¹³⁷ *JC*, 29 Jan. 1869, 4.

¹³⁸ National Archives, HO45/8161, Report of the Board of Deputies on Jewish Marriages to the Home Office, 2.

¹³⁹ LMA, ACC/3121/A/011, MBBB, 1871–8, xi. 458.

¹⁴⁰ *Parliamentary Reports from Commissioners* 1867–8, xxxii. 86–7.

the Deputies' constitution stipulated that concerning religious matters it was 'governed' by the Chief Rabbi and *Haham*. This was modified slightly to 'guidance of the Board on religious matters' in connection with an offer of affiliation made to Reform.¹⁴¹ Predictably, the Reform congregation still found this inconsistent with their principles and rejected a membership invitation that was little more than an attempt to place them under Orthodox jurisdiction. Not until 1885 was a genuine attempt to relax this restriction made and Reform allowed to participate. The *JC* reflected:

The Board of Deputies has always been the embodiment of respect for rabbinical authority. Only those congregations could claim to have a voice in its councils which acknowledged the ecclesiastical authority of the Chief Rabbi. Now that fundamental principle is set aside. The Board imposes no longer any ecclesiastical test upon its would-be constituents.¹⁴²

This did not, though, signal a dramatic shift, merely the inclusion of one (increasingly minor) difference. The Deputies were careful not to legitimize further secession and continued to act repressively towards new developments.

The power the Board conferred upon the Chief Rabbinate through this adherence was a critical prop to Adler's authority, which otherwise relied upon voluntary subscription. In reciprocation the Rabbinate lent its spiritual sanction to the Deputies, dignifying their existence at a time when many Jews were unsure of their necessity. The Board and the Chief Rabbinate were mutually reinforcing. Throughout this period, as prior to emancipation, they interacted to direct the character of the community, preserving its coherence and regulating its Orthodoxy. That the Anglo-Jewish community was closely united and suffered little fission in the nineteenth century, compared to many continental communities, owes much to the Board's coercive use of its marriage powers in conjunction with the moral authority of the Chief Rabbi. Crucial to this symbiosis was the close relationship between Moses Montefiore and Nathan Adler. The two men shared similar conceptions of Jewry's place in the modern world and the necessity of tempering equality that encroached upon the faith. Even without this cooperation it seems inevitable that the Board, despite pretensions, would become involved in religion. Putatively non-religious, the Board's representation was paradoxically

¹⁴¹ LMA, ACC/3121/A/011, MBBD, 1871–8, xi. 193.

¹⁴² *JC*, 21 May 1886, 9.

located in synagogue membership. Only religious members of Anglo-Jewry could participate; those unaffiliated to congregations had no access. The Board's function was also partisan: its task was to further the interests of a religious minority. Directed by members of the communal elite possessed of a natural inclination to guide their coreligionists as they thought best, it is unsurprising that the Deputies interfered to significantly influence Anglo-Jewry's religious character in the post-emancipation decades.

IV

According to the terms of its constitution the Board of Deputies of British Jews had no mandate to interfere in the affairs of foreign Jews. Its purview was restricted to the British Empire and, in reality, concentrated within Britain. But both before and after emancipation a large portion of the Board's activities was concerned with Jewish communities beyond these limits. Until 1873, when a constitutional clause was created to legitimize these actions, sympathizers justified them by 'prescriptive usage', whilst the critical characterized them '*ultra vires*'.¹⁴³ The *JC* supported Board intervention, deeming assisting foreign Jews 'the direction in which it has most successfully worked'.¹⁴⁴

There was, indeed, a well-established tradition of intercession abroad, dating back to the very foundation year: 'From 1760 to 1783, from the Jews of Jamaica to the Jews of Romania, the representatives . . . have always been looked up to by our distressed coreligionists in the four quarters of the globe for support and help in every emergency.'¹⁴⁵ This continued into the post-emancipation decades, when for considerable periods—the early 1860s, late 1870s, and 1880s—the majority of Board work involved Jews abroad. It was an age when many Jewish communities throughout the world, suffering often increasingly virulent forms of prejudice and persecution, needed assistance. The Board

¹⁴³ *JC*, 25 Aug. 1871, 3. The new Clause 3 read: 'That the Board shall also, when they deem intervention desirable, use their influence and exertions in favour of Jewish communities or individuals in foreign countries, in cases of oppression, wrong or misfortune, which may come under the notice of the Board.' See *ibid.* 23 Jan. 1874, 713.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.* 5 Nov. 1858, 4.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.* 28 Nov. 1873, 579.

recognized its religious duty to provide it. Nathan Adler beseeched the Deputies in 1865:

Now, when our brethren cry into us that we may help them to *save life*, must not all our feelings of humanity respond to the appeal? It is surely the holiest duty of our brethren in a happier land, who have hands full of kindness and sympathy, to come forward and help the distressed.¹⁴⁶

Backed by such injunctions the Board pressed Jewish rights in a multitude of places, from Morocco and Gibraltar, Romania and Bulgaria, to Palestine and Persia. Numerous methods were employed to effect improvement in their co-religionists' condition. Rulers were memorialized with requests for greater rights; the Foreign Office was spurred to exert a civilizing influence; generous sums of money were donated; press publicity employed to garner sympathetic opinion; and, the ultimate measure, Montefiore undertook personal missions. Beneficial results were achieved, especially at the beginning of the period. In September 1860, after Board promptings, the Foreign Office secured restitution and permission to rebuild their synagogue for Jewish riot victims in Galatz.¹⁴⁷ In a *cause célèbre* of 1864, Montefiore obtained not only the pardon of several wrongly imprisoned Jews in Tangiers but a decree from the Sultan pledging justice to all Moroccan Jews in future.¹⁴⁸

Despite such incidents, the Deputies' foreign assistance was distinguished more by its restricted and set nature than its achievements. Unlike other contemporary Jewish organizations seeking to relieve Jews internationally, such as the Alliance Israélite Universelle (AIU) or the Anglo-Jewish Association, the Board did not sponsor long-term ameliorative projects, promote Jewish education, or attempt pre-emptive measures to avert anti-Jewish incidents.¹⁴⁹ It waited until directly appealed to by those already suffering. Abroad, the Board was fundamentally a reactive force. At times, the Deputies refused to take action even when informed of anti-Semitism by other agencies. When the AIU drew the Board's notice to the Jews of Serbia being deprived of their

¹⁴⁶ LMA, ACC/3121/A/010, MBBB, 1864–71, x. 86. Emphasis in original.

¹⁴⁷ LMA, ACC/3121/A/009, MBBB, 1859–64, ix. 96.

¹⁴⁸ *The Times*, 1 Feb. 1864, 10.

¹⁴⁹ The exception to this was Board involvement, particularly the application of Montefiore's testimonial fund for the Jewish population of Palestine, where, alongside emergency aid, efforts were undertaken to develop infrastructure and improve education.

benefits, it was informed that ‘as this Board has not received from that community any application, official or otherwise, soliciting its aid, it has not thought fit at present to offer its intervention’.¹⁵⁰ The *JC* would frequently excoriate the ‘uncharitableness and unreasonableness’ of this rectitude.¹⁵¹ What happens, the paper wondered, if ‘the sufferers might be so situated as to be physically prevented from imploring help, or might be so terrified into silence as not to dare to make known their distress except by look and gesture’.¹⁵² The Board had no answer to this trenchant point, and merely ignored the newspaper’s urgings for swifter responses.

It was more concerned with justifying its intervention. Most appeals for aid were carefully checked and corroborated. Establishing their veracity was of paramount importance to an institution unsure of the propriety of its actions. On several occasions pursuing dubious claims had embarrassed the Board. British authorities noted in the above-mentioned Galatz incident that Serbian Jews had exaggerated their losses when applying to the Board.¹⁵³ In 1862, having been advised both by the Chief Rabbi and AIU that a British–Swiss commercial treaty in negotiation required an equality clause, the Board made representations to the government only to be informed that no such treaty existed.¹⁵⁴ Mistakes like this revealed the Board’s unprofessional nature and risked future cooperation with the state.

A significant part of the problem lay in the Deputies’ administration, which contained no provision for foreign action. Such activity being unauthorized, mechanisms had never developed to efficiently process appeals. Not until 1877 was a motion carried to establish a permanent foreign affairs committee. The financial system was most crippling. Bereft of independent resources, the Board was forced to inform most petitioners ‘that it has no funds whatever at its disposal available for such a purpose’.¹⁵⁵ There was the consideration that too liberal and rapid aid ‘might operate prejudicially . . . creating an incentive to bigotry and avarice, to commit similar acts of cruelty’.¹⁵⁶ But, doubtless, it was at times convenient for the Board to have few resources. Pleading poverty enabled it to reject the majority of entreaties it received and thereby avoid the possibility of becoming a perpetual charity for foreign Jews.

¹⁵⁰ LMA, ACC/3121/A/009, MBBB, 1859–64, ix. 160.

¹⁵¹ *JC*, 25 Sept. 1863, 4. ¹⁵² *Ibid.* 14 Aug. 1863, 4.

¹⁵³ LMA, ACC/3121/A/009, MBBB, 1859–64, ix. 97.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.* 250.

¹⁵⁵ LMA, ACC/3121/A/011, MBBB, 1871–8, xi. 365.

¹⁵⁶ LMA, ACC/3121/A/009, MBBB, 1859–64, ix. 17.

Post-emancipation, Board assistance for abused co-religionists abroad was seriously limited.

That it existed at all was in large part due to the sympathetic attitude of the British Foreign Office. Not only did the department tolerate such Jewish activity, it was intricately involved with it.

No matter what government was at the helm of affairs, whether Conservative or Liberal, whether headed by the Earl of Derby or Lord Palmerston, an application from the Board of Deputies to the Foreign Office invariably met with a prompt and friendly response. The Earls of Aberdeen and Malmesbury evinced the same benevolence as Earl Russell; and to the powerful interposition of humane England the Jews all over the world are indebted for the mitigation of much suffering.¹⁵⁷

For once the *JC* was little exaggerating. Successive governments not only entertained Jewish suggestions but sought to incorporate the community in decision-making processes. Information flowed in both directions, the Foreign Office regularly forwarding relevant dispatches to the community. Layard wrote to Derby from Turkey describing Jewish sufferings: 'I would ask your Lordship to have the kindness to forward these papers to some leading member of the Jewish community in London, as the information they contain might enable it to judge how far additional help is needed, and could be afforded.'¹⁵⁸ The government saw the Anglo-Jewish community as the legitimate source for dealing with matters concerning foreign Jews. The Board was not treated merely as a supplicant but as an interest group; one of the 'special publics' or informed lobbies that influenced Britain's foreign and imperial policies in the second half of the nineteenth century.¹⁵⁹ Calvert, HM Consul in Monastir, exchanged almost weekly correspondence with the Deputies throughout May–July 1864, as he oversaw the application of funds they had raised, at his behest, for the fire-ravaged Jewish quarter.¹⁶⁰ Henry Jones, Consul General in Tabrez, wrote to Montefiore detailing the suffering of starving Persian Jews: 'I consider it my duty to bring the case to your notice trusting that it may be in your power in some degree to relieve the sufferers.'¹⁶¹ Anglo-Jewish confidence was immensely boosted by

¹⁵⁷ *JC*, 18 Apr. 1862, 4.

¹⁵⁸ *Parliamentary Papers* 1878, xxxvi. 304, Turkey No. 1 Further Correspondence Respecting the Affairs of Turkey, Layard to Derby, 5 Sept. 1877.

¹⁵⁹ J. Darwin, 'Imperialism and the Victorians: The Dynamics of Territorial Expansion', *English Historical Review*, 112/447 (June 1997), 629.

¹⁶⁰ LMA, ACC/3121/A/010, MBBB, 1864–71, x. 24.

¹⁶¹ LMA, ACC/3121/A/011, MBBB, 1871–8, xi. 27.

such cooperation, which facilitated much of the Deputies' work abroad and reinforced their influence as a Jewish conduit to the government.

But the Board's relationship with the Foreign Office was something of a double-edged sword. The Board routinely submitted all memorials and plans for intervention to the government before proceeding with them. This had the practical benefit of obtaining British endorsement, or at least sanction—something that no doubt considerably bolstered their efficacy. But it also tied the Board to the government's line, curtailing its independence of action. Obsessed with maintaining this affinity, the Board refused to act through any other means. If the British government would not pursue an issue, neither would the Board. The Deputies also worried about pestering the state with Jewry's continual problems and carefully screened those it referred. Many smaller grievances, alongside cases of chronic complaint, were thus ignored.

Some in the community recognized that the Board's official attachment was not an 'unalloyed good'.¹⁶² In the discussions preceding the formation of the AJA, Israel Davis observed that often, in fact, for the task of aiding foreign Jews, this connection was 'perhaps its greatest disqualification',¹⁶³ restricting, as it did, direct or autonomous communication or arrangements with foreign organizations: 'What would English ministers say to an English Board of Registration making direct appeals to a government at Bucharest?'¹⁶⁴ This was a sensitive argument. It struck at the heart of the emancipated community's identity. The Board, first and foremost the representative organ of Anglo-Jewry, had always scrupulously protected its Englishness when advocating Jewish causes by working only 'under the aegis of the British government', even though this limited its capacity to intercede.¹⁶⁵ The *JC* appreciated the necessity of this:

If we Jews born in England desire to claim and retain the name and position of Englishmen . . . we must not imperil that right in any sense by recognising direct communication with any foreign prince or potentate whatsoever . . . it has been an invariable practice of Englishmen to regard with jealous eye any communication with foreign governments otherwise than by the medium, or at least with the aid of the government of England.¹⁶⁶

The Board felt that to maintain the English aspect of their dual identity, Anglo-Jewry had to sublimate their Diasporic sympathies to the considerations of the British government.

¹⁶² *JC*, 1 Sept. 1871, 10.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.* 31 Mar. 1871, 11.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.* 10 Nov. 1871, 11.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

One major ramification of this attitude was the Board's refusal to cooperate with foreign Jewish bodies in providing relief. At the achievement of emancipation there were few Jewish organizations that could attempt international relief, and the Board was able occasionally to construct multinational efforts under its leadership. This happened most notably over the Mortara Affair in 1858, when the Board 'appealed for cooperation to the Jewish congregational bodies in the principal cities and towns of Germany and the United States of America . . . to the Central Consistory of Israelites of France, and to the central Jewish authorities of Amsterdam' in recovering the child.¹⁶⁷ The international outcry and offence caused to British public opinion by this example of papal zeal assured the Board that its character would not be endangered in this instance.

Throughout the period, the Board was also very amenable to collecting international donations for the various funds it sponsored. These were sometimes considerable. The 'munificent amount' of £1,936 17s. 8d. was received from American congregations towards the 1866 Holy Land Relief Fund.¹⁶⁸ That the Board could elicit such contributions would indicate that it had a notable profile in the Jewish world. Never, though, were such transactions reciprocated. All requests for pecuniary assistance or subscriptions to other communities' fund-raisers were routinely refused. This financial reticence reflected a general, unilateralist attitude that saw all collaboration offers rebuffed. The US Jewish Board of Delegates was keen for close interaction with the Board, offering to participate in their ventures and repeatedly requesting 'to exchange publications with your Board, and to communicate with you whenever the common interests both institutions have at heart may be served'.¹⁶⁹ The Board was, at best, tardy in this exchange of information and continually resolved 'that it would be inexpedient to associate any delegate to and in conjunction with the Board'.¹⁷⁰

Most illustrative of the Board's insularity was its (lack of) relationship with the AIU. The Alliance, founded in the aftermath of Mortara, represented a new development in Jewish organization, being a body devoted to promoting Jewish interests through international effort. It immediately sought an *entente cordiale* with the Deputies, deferentially seeking their help 'to obtain for those still deprived of them, a complete

¹⁶⁷ National Archives, FO881/811, Foreign Office Correspondence about the Jew Boy, Mortara, 1858, 14.

¹⁶⁸ LMA, ACC/3121/A/010, MBBB, 1864–71, x, 102.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid. 92.

¹⁷⁰ LMA, ACC/3121/A/009, MBBB, 1859–64, ix, 6.

civil and political emancipation'.¹⁷¹ Despite this noble objective, the Board offered only its 'sentiments of respect and friendly consideration'.¹⁷² The AIU continued attempts for several years to establish more intimate fraternization but the Board consistently denied it access to intelligence and excluded it from activities. The Deputies were not interested in such partnership, even for the cause of distressed Jewry. Partly a matter of pride—as the more venerable institution it did not relish the offer of 'adhesion' to this nascent society—the fundamental reason lay in Anglo-Jewry's English nationalism, which it valued before this Jewish internationalism. Based in France, hoping 'to organise and unite with one accord the intellectual and pecuniary resources of the Israelite community throughout the world', and described by the *JC* as 'the first organised recognition in modern times of the brotherhood of Israel', the Alliance promoted a transnational conception of Jewishness beyond the hyphenated emancipation image that placed Jewry firmly behind nationality.¹⁷³ The Anglo-Jewish Board, staffed by Englishmen of the Jewish persuasion and connected to the British government, could not empathize with this interpretation of identity and avoided association with it. So did most English Jews. The *JC* reported in 1867 that of the 5,000 AIU members a feeble 29 were English; in 1870 British subscriptions were still 'amusingly small'.¹⁷⁴

There was, however, significant sympathy for the objects of the Alliance, if not its organization, within Anglo-Jewry. Some suggested forming an English version. John Simon was an early supporter of such a scheme, which he pictured as bolstering the Jewish image: 'To the world, accustomed to regard our race as scattered outcasts . . . we shall offer the most signal protest, as we shall present the spectacle of a people undaunted by the oppressions of ages.'¹⁷⁵ The *JC* was hesitant.

There is no occasion for such a body among us, when there is an organisation in existence which has within late years faithfully and successfully discharged the mission of oppressed Israel's pleader. . . . It will be the Board's own fault

¹⁷¹ ACC/3121/A/009, MBBD, 1859–64, ix, 115, 135.

¹⁷² *Ibid.* 154.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.* 135, and *JC*, 2 Aug. 1867, 4. The Board, as noted earlier, had been willing to collaborate with the older Consistoire Centrale, a French Jewish body not unlike itself in organization and intention. The AIU, however, was another matter: a non-representative lobby group with international membership was a concept alien to the Board. To compound matters the relationship between the institutions' respective presidents, Moses Montefiore and Adolphe Crémieux, was less than convivial since the pair had disagreed during the Damascus blood libel: see J. Frankel, *The Damascus Affair: 'Ritual Murder', Politics, and the Jews in 1840* (Cambridge, 1997).

¹⁷⁴ *JC*, 2 Aug. 1867, 4, and 27 May 1870, 4.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.* 4 Jan. 1861, 5.

should the period ever come when the intelligent and feeling portion of the community, dissatisfied with the coldness, petty-mindedness, and vacillation of the central authority, should deem it necessary for the welfare of Israel to have recourse to more enlightened views . . . and vigorous hands.¹⁷⁶

With the Board's less than comprehensive involvement in Jewish relief this time soon arrived. By late 1868 communal commentators were beginning to suggest, 'if our British pride does not allow of our acting a subordinate part as a branch of a tree planted on foreign soil, why is there not founded an Anglo-Jewish Alliance?'¹⁷⁷ A convenient opportunity was provided by French defeat in the Franco-Prussian War, which severely disrupted the AIU's work. 'At this crisis, then', the *JC* urged, 'it is clearly the place of England—*especially* of England—to take up the work of the Alliance.'¹⁷⁸ In late March 1871 a conference of Anglo-Jewish notables resolved to found an Anglo-Jewish Association, whose catholic objectives were 'the raising of the status of the Jew, wheresoever situated, politically, educationally, industrially and charitably; in fact, to work everywhere on behalf of the Jews'.¹⁷⁹

The Board, jealous of its position, fought the development. Having nationalized the act of aiding foreign Jewries, the AJA could not be opposed upon identity grounds, so Deputies attacked it as an extravagance. Morris Oppenheim railed that 'the existence in our community of two organisations with identical objects is unnecessary—a waste of power, and likely to be most injurious to the communal well-being'.¹⁸⁰ Lionel Cohen feared the precedent set, warning of further fission and the ruin of communal authority:

The process is one capable of indefinite repetition, and imitation . . . why may not Mr. Moses Choverhop and his friends meet at the Middlesex Street School in London; send off a memorial, post haste, in the name of the Jews of London, through the 'kind agency' of the Rev. Dr. Schmuzerai, and drop it into the hands of the Grand Duke Constantine.¹⁸¹

The AJA threatened what the Board held most dear: a coherent community under its stewardship. No matter the noble cause of the new institution, the Board petulantly treated it as rival, not a collaborator, and in an ill-judged and self-defeating move, rejected interaction.¹⁸² This sparked several months of caustic discourse in the *JC*, as supporters

¹⁷⁶ Ibid. 18 Jan. 1861, 4.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid. 13 Nov. 1868, 5.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid. 30 June 1871, 8. Emphasis in original.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid. 7 July 1871, 11.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid. 11 Aug. 1871, 8.

¹⁸¹ Ibid. 25 Aug. 1871, 8.

¹⁸² LMA, ACC/3121/A/010, MBBB, 1864–71, x. 412.

of each faction argued their case. The Board, adopting the specious line of asserting that its competence abroad rendered the AJA extraneous, had little real argument and was savaged. Several incisive correspondents exposed the faults of its inadequate foreign interventions, largely overlooked until now. The anonymous 'B' observed most tellingly, 'be it well understood, to the praise of the Board of Deputies, whenever they have interfered for our brethren in less happy circumstances than ourselves, they have done so, not because they were the Board of Deputies, *but in spite of so being*'.¹⁸³

The Association quickly established itself. By September 1872 it boasted supplementary branches in Birmingham, Liverpool, and Manchester.¹⁸⁴ The Deputies refused to be reconciled to its existence and the two organizations settled into a period of protracted antagonism.¹⁸⁵ One particular, ongoing problem for the Board was the prominent presence of Reform Jews in the AJA. Reformers had played a significant role in its formation and many Orthodox were suspicious that the AJA would be used as a vehicle to advance their agenda within the communal power structure, from which the Board had excluded them. It was the most Orthodox Deputies—Montagu, L. Cohen, Oppenheim—who most consistently and vociferously opposed the AJA. Their resentment echoed within the community. Notwithstanding notable exceptions, such as Salomons, de Worms, and Jessel, the honorary secretary of the Leeds AJA had cause to lament in the *JC* of June 1878 that many leading Orthodox Jews 'held back from belonging to a society simply because it originated with those who follow what is termed "Reform"'.¹⁸⁶

This Orthodox concern amplified the Board's fundamental contention: the threat to its self-ascribed monopoly over Anglo-Jewish-government communication. At a June 1876 conference proposed by the AJA to construct a *modus operandi* between the institutions, the Board approved united action with the caveat: 'That provided the Anglo-Jewish Association will engage not to communicate with any Government or ruler except through the Board or the *Alliance Israelite Universelle* in Paris. . .'.¹⁸⁷ De Worms denounced the

¹⁸³ LMA, ACC/3121/A/010, MBBB, 1864–71, x, 13. Emphasis in original.

¹⁸⁴ *JC*, 27 Sept. 1872, 360.

¹⁸⁵ The friction between the two bodies should not be exaggerated. There were individuals who served on both, and after several years, slight cooperation was in evidence. By 1874, for instance, the Board was referring cases it received relating to Jewish education abroad to the AJA.

¹⁸⁶ *JC*, 21 June 1878, 4.

¹⁸⁷ LMA, ACC/3121/A/011, MBBB, 1871–8, xi, 390.

Board's 'patronising tone' and criticized its 'assumed monopoly' as 'what all monopolies now are, abuses of the past and utterly incompatible with the progressive spirit of the age in which we live'.¹⁸⁸ The Board was still unwilling to accept reality. Its traditionalist vision of the community required one body, itself, to oversee the delicate reception of the 'proper' Anglo-Jewish image in the surrounding culture. The more dynamic, internationally connected, and Reform-influenced AJA disrupted this and skewed the community's presentation.

The Board made a final effort to stamp its conception upon the situation over December 1876. During the early stages of the Eastern Crisis the AIU invited the Deputies and AJA to an international conference in Paris to consider the condition of Jews in Turkey. The Association accepted but the Board, chained to its Foreign Office shibboleth, sympathetically declined: 'it feels it could not render any assistance by being represented thereat, more especially as it had already addressed an earnest appeal to the British Government praying that the condition of the Jews of Servia and of the Turkish provinces may be seriously considered.'¹⁸⁹ This proved to be a grave miscalculation. Far from tainting themselves with Jewish cosmopolitanism by attending and thereby raising suspicions as to their Englishness, the AJA managed to subsume the Jewish project within it. In a conference conducted in French, de Worms, AJA President, gave his banquet speech in English: 'the illustrious President has associated my name with my country, thereby rendering it almost imperative upon me to use my mother tongue.'¹⁹⁰ Upon returning to Britain the Association delegates waited upon Lord Derby in the name 'not only of the Jews of England, but the Jews of the civilised world'; he expressed himself 'glad to communicate with your association on any occasion when you desire to see me'.¹⁹¹ With the government not only happy to deal with the Association but happy to deal with them when they represented international Jewish concerns, the Board's myth was finally shattered. Without Gentile backing its position was untenable.

¹⁸⁸ *JC*, 28 July 1876, 259.

¹⁸⁹ LMA, ACC/3121/A/011, MBBD, 1871–8, xi, 410. A proposed amendment to send Board delegates was lost 4–7.

¹⁹⁰ *JC*, 29 Dec. 1876, 619.

¹⁹¹ *Ibid.* 619. The British press also gave generally sympathetic coverage to the conference, the *JC* of 5 Jan. 1877, 12, noting positive comments from *The Times*, *Standard*, *Oriental Star*, *Spectator*, and *Saturday Review*.

Worse, in this incident the Deputies had sacrificed much of their remaining communal credibility. Reluctance to participate in multinational efforts might be understood given the public mood of 1876, where the Bulgarian Agitation had provoked questions concerning Anglo-Jewry's patriotism. But the Deputies were not actuated solely (or perhaps even primarily) by fear of anti-Jewish criticism. Their concerns were internal. So desperate were they to maintain their presumed privilege that they had sycophantically informed the Foreign Office of their non-attendance, reiterating 'that the Board should, as heretofore, communicate with her Majesty's Government, as the proper medium of intercourse between the subjects of this country and foreign powers or their representatives'.¹⁹² The obvious implication was that the AJA, deviating from this accepted formula, was not, therefore, a bona fide Anglo-Jewish organization—not loyal like the Board. In suggesting this, the Board transgressed a golden communal rule. 'If there be dirty linen let it be washed *en famille*. Why should the Foreign Secretary be made acquainted with any difference of opinion existing in the community? Can the authority of the Board be raised by depressing that of any other communal organisation?'¹⁹³ Communal censure was long and harsh. 'One can but stigmatise such conduct as unworthy and unpatriotic—un-Jewish,' wrote one *JC* correspondent; another characterized it as 'ignoble jealousy' that 'passes all comprehension'.¹⁹⁴ The Board now had few options. After much stalling it formed the Conjoint Foreign Committee with the AJA in April 1878. This finally saw the Board concede its cherished principle of official Jewish interlocutor; from then on neither organization 'shall communicate with the British Government upon the subject without the consent of the other'.¹⁹⁵

V

The Board's exertions for foreign communities occasioned involvement in many countries. But no region occupied their energy and resources more persistently than the Danubian Principalities, especially Romania. An area at this time of considerable geo-political instability, witnessing the creation of nations and shifting of the great powers' influence spheres,

¹⁹² LMA, ACC/3121/A/011, MBBD, 1871–8, xi. 415–16.

¹⁹³ *JC*, 12 Dec. 1877, 4. ¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.* 5.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.* 19 Apr. 1878, 5.

Anglo-Jewish interference here was not merely philanthropic but had inevitable political ramifications. Executed under British patronage these consequences concerned not only Jewish life in the respective countries or Anglo-Jewish definition in England but were intertwined with the cause and principles of Britain's foreign policy. It is therefore an excellent case study illustrating the salient aspects of the Board's foreign ventures whilst also locating these within the context of the contemporary British and European diplomatic world.

The international agreement of 1858 granting internal autonomy to the Principalities was also supposed to guarantee legal equality for their citizens. In respect to the Jews, this measure was never enforced and frequently flouted by a number of states for the entire period. From 1861 onwards, the Foreign Office and locally situated British consuls, often following direct petitions from native Jews, were engaged in attempting to dampen anti-Semitism and enforce civic equality. They interacted with a number of Anglo-Jews in this effort. The published Parliamentary Papers upon this subject record 146 communications sent by the Foreign Office to seven interested Jews and Jewish organizations; many more were received from them.¹⁹⁶ The Board did not feature prominently within this correspondence, receiving only eighteen letters—the third highest amount. Francis Goldsmid was most involved, accounting for half with seventy-three; followed by Montefiore, the recipient of thirty-eight.¹⁹⁷ The Deputies were certainly far from their ideal of supervising community–state dialogue.

In this instance, as with most, that they did not occupy the pivotal role was their fault. The Board displayed the slow and constrained attitude that characterized its activity toward foreign co-religionists. Its first notable attempt at relief was made via a memorial to the Prince of Serbia in October 1864 conveying gratitude for his benevolence 'and also to express hope that the National Assembly, animated by the same kindly feeling, will remove any political or social grievances, the existence of which may debar the subjects of your Royal Highness of the Jewish faith from the full enjoyment of equal rights with

¹⁹⁶ See *Parliamentary Papers* 1867, xxxvii, Correspondence Respecting the Condition of the Jews in Servia; 1867, lxxiv, Correspondence Respecting the Persecution of the Jews in Moldavia and Further Correspondence Respecting the Persecution of the Jews in Moldavia; and 1877, xli, Correspondence Respecting the Condition and Treatment of the Jews in Servia and Romania, 1867–1876.

¹⁹⁷ The other mentioned correspondents were Lionel de Rothschild with eleven, the AIU with four, the Chief Rabbi with one, and Salomons with one.

their fellow-countrymen'.¹⁹⁸ This achieved little; within a matter of weeks anti-Semitic press diatribes, permitted by Serbian censors, had incited the killing of several Jews. Despite Alliance promptings the Board did not react and entered a period of virtual hibernation until Goldsmid's parliamentary condemnation 'refocused' their attention.¹⁹⁹ In its dormancy others took action. Goldsmid, using his influence as an MP and regularly sharing information with the AIU, was by far and consistently the most active Jewish party concerned with Serbian and Romanian Jewry. His methods were also more productive than the Board's. Where the Board ineffectively memorialized, Goldsmid had evoked public sympathy through Parliament. While the Board avoided further action with such excuses as 'these aspersions have been refuted again and again . . . slanders of this calumnious nature were beneath the notice of this Board', Goldsmid pushed the agenda.²⁰⁰ Unwilling to accept the lack of progress, he was even prepared to express discontent regarding Foreign Office results:

Although Mr. Green and Mr. St. Clair appear to have done all they could, the information contained in the papers as to the disposition of the Romanian Government, and the probable result of the kind exertions of Lord Stanley . . . on behalf of the Jews of Jassy, does not strike me as very satisfactory.²⁰¹

No ameliorative effort was to prove satisfactory in this era. The 1886 Board report admitted that despite considerable Anglo-Jewish labours, 'unfortunately these efforts, which have been chiefly directed through diplomatic agency, have not yet produced any appreciable results. The flagrant violation of the rights secured to the Jews by the Treaty of Berlin has continued unchecked.'²⁰² Nearly thirty years worth of remonstrance had achieved nothing. Yet the Board was slow to appreciate the inefficacy of its methods. Immediately following the above statement was a report of a CFC deputation to Salisbury, which had sought, again, to enlist his support for enforcing the Berlin Treaty in Romania.²⁰³ The horse the Board was flogging was long dead; in truth, it had been stillborn. No measure the Board or other Jews employed could have hoped to relieve Romanian Jews.

¹⁹⁸ *Parliamentary Papers* 1867, xxxvii. 10, Russell to Longworth, 31 Oct. 1864, enclosing Board memorial dated 1 Oct 1864.

¹⁹⁹ LMA, ACC/3121/A/010, MBBB, 1864-71, x. 150.

²⁰⁰ LMA, ACC/3121/A/009, MBBB, 1859-64, ix. 44.

²⁰¹ *Parliamentary Papers* 1877, xli. 21, Goldsmid to Hammond, 10 June 1867.

²⁰² LMA, ACC/3121/G1/01/002, BDAR, 1880-9, Apr. 1886, 35.

²⁰³ *Ibid.* 36.

In 1867 the Board utilized its greatest weapon: a mission from Montefiore, the course of which demonstrates well the problems of Jewish diplomacy and its inability to prevent persecution. Montefiore had resolved upon travelling after receiving 'so frequently and so urgently' requests from Romania, and sought the Deputies' sanction to go with 'great force and significance' as the 'delegate of our community'.²⁰⁴ He set off auspiciously, carrying the endorsement of the British state and approval from five other European governments.²⁰⁵ Over August and September he interviewed the Prince and several ministers, being very sanguine about the prospects:

from the high character and intelligence of the Prince, and the assurances given to me by himself and by members of his Government, I have every reason to hope that the laws of the country, which provide for the protection of the Jews as well as of all the other inhabitants of Romania, will be carried out in their full integrity.²⁰⁶

This optimism was misplaced. Consul Green was impressed with his deportment but doubted it convinced the Romanians. As he reported to Stanley,

It was a great pleasure for me to mark . . . the irresistible impression produced by the dignified and modest language in which Sir Moses Montefiore pleaded the cause of his coreligionists. I have no doubt that both the Prince and his Minister had brought themselves to expect words of a very different import. . . . I should be deceiving your Lordship were I to say that I at present perceive any symptoms leading me to hope that the Romanian Government will avail of the excellent opportunity afforded by Sir Moses Montefiore's presence here to get out of a difficulty created by their own folly, and to put an end to a disgraceful state of things.²⁰⁷

Indeed, if anything, Montefiore's presence exacerbated the situation. Anti-Semitic journals seized the opportunity to trumpet conspiracies of international Jewish power. The *Natinuea* opened a petition in the capital to prevent 'these bloodsuckers, the Hebrews' from 'transform[ing] our land into a Palestine'.²⁰⁸ At one point a crowd of thousands surrounded Montefiore's hotel and called for his death. The country was so

²⁰⁴ LMA, ACC/3121/A/010, MBBD, 1864–71, x, 157.

²⁰⁵ *The Times*, 21 Sept. 1867, 9. These governments comprised Austria, France, Italy, Prussia, and Russia.

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.* 9.

²⁰⁷ *Parliamentary Papers* 1877, xli, 56, Green to Stanley, 24 Aug. 1867.

²⁰⁸ L. Loewe (ed.), *Diaries of Sir Moses and Lady Montefiore*, 2 vols. (London, 1890), ii, 200.

agitated that a trip to Jassy was cancelled on the British Consul's warning that it 'would be the signal for serious disturbances'.²⁰⁹ Confronted with such prejudice Montefiore and the Board had little response. By April 1868 Montefiore was enquiring at the Foreign Office whether he should return to 'remind' the Romanians of their 'repeated promises'. The government was of the opinion that they had 'exhausted all the means' for interfering.²¹⁰ Having failed with its most direct option, the Board returned to its low-key attempts of periodically petitioning the government to remedy the 'habitual and virulent persecutions' that continued in the region, although being 'extremely reluctant again to address your Lordship upon a subject which this Board has too frequently had occasion to bring under the notice of your Lordship, and your predecessors in office'.²¹¹

The Board's reserve drew communal criticism throughout the period.

I do not agree with the views usually expressed by the Board of Deputies, that we should sit still and let things go as they may, and abide patiently. Such were the views of our ancestors in Egypt, when they complained to Moses that he had done them a great injury by his interfering; but had he not persisted in his course we might have been slaves to this day.²¹²

But Anglo-Jewry's expectations of change were founded upon a fundamental misunderstanding of the possibilities. In common with the attitude of British officials, the Board always showed sovereigns due respect and refrained from blaming them for anti-Jewish enactments. It projected the tolerant rationality of British governance onto others. Consequently, by address or interview appealing in the name of civilization, it consistently sought to work through rulers. In the Principalities this was a poor strategy. Prince Charles of Romania, occupying a recently revived throne, was weak and unable to contravene popular sentiment or government desires.²¹³ British diplomats by the end of

²⁰⁹ *Parliamentary Papers* 1877, xli. 58, Green to Stanley, 2 Sept. 1867.

²¹⁰ *Ibid.* 92. Montefiore to Hammond, 10 Apr. 1868. Montefiore did try and meet the Prince the next year when he was visiting Paris. But slow preparation, including a wait to procure letters of introduction from the Foreign Office, meant that Montefiore got no further than Dover before the Prince returned home; see LMA, ACC/3121/A/010, MBBD, 1864–71, x. 320.

²¹¹ *Parliamentary Papers* 1877, xli. 174, Joseph Montefiore to Clarendon, 25 Aug. 1869.

²¹² *JC*, 2 Feb. 1877, 5.

²¹³ U. Henriques, 'Journey to Romania, 1867', in Lipman and Lipman (eds.), *Century of Moses Montefiore*, 248.

the 1860s had begun to comprehend that the Romanian state was at least complicit in the anti-Jewish prejudice. Consul Green wrote to Lord Lyons,

I feel certain that Prince Charles would lay down his life rather than wittingly be a party to Jewish persecution. . . . But the profits and advantages to be derived from a Jewish persecution . . . were too tempting to be abandoned by official underlings, unfortunately under the present system recruited from the worst classes, and secure in the approbation of their fellows.²¹⁴

The situation was the same in Serbia, where a mercantile class threatened by Jewish competition pressured the state to maintain discrimination. Even had the Board been more adroit and changed tactics, there was little it could have accomplished against the vested interests driving anti-Jewish prejudices. Consul St Clair realized that an insuperable gulf in values ultimately prevented resolution. In an interview with the Prince he

could not refrain from saying that I much feared that as soon as his Highness would leave abuses and illegalities would recommence, as the authorities were either weak or unwilling to do their duty, and this unhappy people was anything but fit for a European constitution and civilised laws, which they could not comprehend, appreciate, or respect, as they were foreign importations, and not the result of the history, habits, and the customs of the Rouman [*sic*] nation.²¹⁵

In such circumstances, as Arthur Cohen comprehended, 'history had but too clearly shown how religious toleration could not be effectually secured by a sudden alteration of the laws of a country, how it was generally, the result of a long and arduous struggle in which the leaders of the oppressed sect or people take an active part'.²¹⁶ In such conditions the Board's actions could achieve little beyond salving Anglo-Jewry's conscience. On the ground they were often counter-productive,

²¹⁴ *Parliamentary Papers*, 1867, lxxiv, Further Correspondence Respecting the Persecution of Jews in Moldavia, 4, Green to Lord Lyons, 16 July 1867.

²¹⁵ *Ibid.* 1, St Clair to Green, 28 June 1867, enclosed in Green to Stanley, 6 July 1867. Henriques also notes that the Principalities' struggle for independence had bred an aggressive nationalism within the politically conscious classes, making them particularly hostile to foreign interference; see Henriques, 'Journey', 232.

²¹⁶ *JC*, 9 Mar. 1877, 6. This was a sensitive issue concerning Romania, where it was known to both the Board and British consuls that wealthier sections of the Jewish population were not supportive of intervention on their behalf. M. Halfon, the local President of the AIU, for instance, had 'strongly advised' Montefiore against his visit; see Loewe, *Diaries*, ii. 205.

endangering rather than protecting. The Board's 1886 report noted a telling incident:

Certain Romanian journals accused the Romanian Jews of calumniating their country, and even charged them with high treason in inciting the English Jews to bring false charges against the Romanian government. . . . At Bucharest and other places Jews were required by the Prefects of police to sign protests, prepared by those officers, against the statements of English Jews. Enactments against the Jews followed with increased severity.²¹⁷

The failure of Anglo-Jewish relief ultimately reflected the failure of British assistance. Jewish diplomacy was only as good as the Gentile power backing it. The Board's efforts had relied upon its traditional source of influence: British diplomatic clout. This had been provided throughout the period, in large measure and with considerable sympathy. The Foreign Office and British agents were almost as anxious to protect Romanian Jews as was Anglo-Jewry.²¹⁸ Lord Stanley instructed Consul Green in Bucharest after a lethal anti-Semitic episode in May 1867:

Her Majesty's Government have learned with deep concern that the Jews of Jassy are exposed to cruel persecution, endangering their lives, and destroying their properties. Apply directly to the Prince . . . and represent in the strongest terms the earnest hope of Her Majesty's Government that orders will be immediately sent to the authorities in Jassy to put an end to such outrages, and you will say that unless this is done the Wallachian Government must not be surprised at any diminution of the interest which is felt by Her Majesty's Government in the prosperity of the provinces under their present system of administration.²¹⁹

Romanian treatment of Jews was anathema to British perceptions and the consuls enthusiastically pursued this condemnatory line, not only upset at the barbarity but irritated by the hypocrisy of the Principalities. 'It was a standing reproach I said to a state like Servia,'

²¹⁷ LMA, ACC/3121/G1/01/002, BDAR, 1880–9, Apr. 1886, 38.

²¹⁸ British diplomats had long taken an interest in furthering the rights of Jews in the Principalities. Since negotiations concerning the territories' organization following the Crimean War and particularly after the 1858 Convention of Paris recognized the civil rights of Romanian Jewry, British officials had endeavoured to assist Jewish claims. See E. Feldman, 'The Question of Jewish Emancipation in the Ottoman Empire and the Danubian Principalities after the Crimean War', *JSS* 41/1 (Winter 1979), 54, 59.

²¹⁹ *Parliamentary Papers* 1867, lxxiv, Correspondence Respecting the Persecution of the Jews in Moldavia, 2, Stanley to Green, 24 May 1867.

Consul Longworth reported to Clarendon, 'owing its independence to the enforcement of the principles of toleration now acted upon by all civilised Governments, that it should continue to impose civil disabilities on religious grounds.'²²⁰

Britain was not alone in its deprecation. Other European consuls, particularly in the late 1860s, adopted similar strictures. The French Consulate at Jassy was ordered to take 'energetic steps to put a stop to an iniquity which is a dishonour to the Romanian Government' in 1867; the Austrian government addressed a strong remonstrance and even 'shadowed forth' demands for compensation when injuries were inflicted upon some Jews under its protection in 1868.²²¹ Most notable was the joint protest of six consuls at Galatz in July 1867:

We are not aware if there was a foreigner among the Jews, but with respect to the persecution of which the Israelites are notoriously the objects in this country, we think it our strict duty to protest loudly in the name of the Governments which we represent here, against these acts of barbarity.²²²

The Principalities' anti-Jewish prejudice was clearly contrary to European governments' ideals of civilization. It was Britain, of all the powers, however, that protested most vigorously and most frequently, and there was considerable justification for the grateful comment to Stanley of Adolphe Crémieux, President of the AIU: 'Cette manifestation du génie libéral de la Grand Bretagne, qui ne peut manquer d'exciter la vive admiration du monde entière, nous a profondément touché.'²²³

²²⁰ *Parliamentary Papers* 1877, xli. 139, Longworth to Clarendon, 13 Feb. 1869. Only one British agent, a Vice-Consul St John, was less than sympathetic to Romanian Jewry's plight. St John wrote to Granville in July 1872 claiming 'that persecution in the sense conveyed by Sir Francis Goldsmid's speech in the House of Commons does not exist and never has existed in the Principalities . . . Much ill-feeling against the Jews has been engendered in this country by the gross exaggerations promulgated.' Several months later Consul Green wrote to offer a more 'accurate' opinion upon the situation and explain that St John's was at variance with all other agents' attitudes; see xli. 264–70.

²²¹ *Parliamentary Papers* 1867, lxxiv, Correspondence Respecting the Persecution of the Jews in Moldavia, 12, translation of telegram from Paris to French consulate at Jassy, enclosed in Green to Stanley, 4 June 1867, and *Parliamentary Papers* 1877, xli. 119, Lord Bloomfield to Stanley, 11 May 1868.

²²² *Parliamentary Papers* 1867, lxxiv, Further Correspondence Respecting the Persecution of Jews in Moldavia, 9, translation of the protest of the foreign consuls at Galatz enclosed in Green to Stanley, 20 July 1867. The nations represented by these consuls were Austria, France, Britain, Italy, Prussia, and Russia.

²²³ *Parliamentary Papers* 1877, xli. 12, Crémieux to Stanley, 8 May 1867.

For all their good intentions British efforts produced little: 'the unremitting endeavours of this Consulate have been unavailing.'²²⁴ There was only so much the Foreign Office could do. Lionel de Rothschild's request that British ships be sent to Galatz to quell disturbances was answered by Stanley that 'as the Jews in Moldavia, who complain of having been cruelly treated by the authorities do not appear to be British subjects, Her Majesty's Government would not feel themselves justified in employing or threatening the use of force on their behalf.'²²⁵ The British government was careful to observe the rules of international diplomacy. The consuls could resort only to friendly warnings and unofficial pressure, which seldom animated the Romanians, who resented even this. In July 1867 M. Lupascu, Prefect of Galatz, reproached Consul Ward:

Great was my surprise at the contents of your note. . . . Neither the dignity of your office, nor that of the office which I have the honour of holding, allow me to answer you in the language and in the tone you have thought proper to address me. You yourself, Sir, acknowledge that none of these individuals are subjects of your nationality. You can, therefore, well understand that I cannot consider myself competent to discuss this matter with you.²²⁶

Little could be achieved through these constrained methods.

In the early 1870s Goldsmid, and later the Board, suggested to the Foreign Office that Romanian failure to ensure equality of citizenship breached treaty rights and, therefore, justified aggressive intervention. Granville was sympathetic but considered 'that it would not be prudent or politic at the present time to invoke the Suzerain Powers to enforce upon Romania the provisions in regard to the Jews; it is, moreover, doubtful whether Russia would consent to join in a common representation of this nature.'²²⁷ Herein lay the cardinal problem for Britain and Anglo-Jewry, the attitude of other powers. The early failure of the concert of Europe to provide a system for international cooperation and then Britain's post-Palmerston foreign policy emphasis upon non-intervention militated against independent interference in this volatile sphere, especially after 1872–3, when the formation of the *Dreikais-erbund*, closely following the defeat of France, left England somewhat

²²⁴ *Parliamentary Papers* 1867, xxxvii. 26, Longworth to Stanley, 14 Mar. 1867.

²²⁵ *Parliamentary Papers* 1877, xli. 37, Hammond to Rothschild, 23 July 1867.

²²⁶ *Ibid.* 51, Lupascu to Ward, 20 July 1867, enclosed in Green to Stanley, 10 Aug. 1867.

²²⁷ *Parliamentary Papers* 1877, xli. 244, Hammond to Goldsmid, 10 May 1872.

isolated on the European scene.²²⁸ Enquiries were repeatedly made by Britain concerning joint action but the example of the 1867 consular protest was never repeated. The Austrians worried it might embarrass Prince Charles, the German government feared to appear overbearing to a close neighbour, whilst the Russians 'restrained from urging on the Principalities a greater freedom for the Jews, being afraid that the same argument might recoil on themselves'.²²⁹ Other powers had other agendas, which often required mollifying the Romanians. Jewish diplomacy could accomplish no permanent improvement in this situation.

The Jewish problem occupied a space within international relations. Treatment of Jewish communities was an aspect of states' foreign policies, a part of the power game. The *Saturday Review* believed Russia was lax in supporting Jewish relief in the Principalities because 'It has always been the mission of Russia to encourage maladministration in neighbouring states, and to propagate discontent; and the sufferings of a few thousands of Jews will be regarded as a cheap price for the eventual necessity or plausibility of Russian intervention.'²³⁰ Britain, in a similar way, also used persecuted Jewish populations to advance its aims. In many places around the globe 'the condition of the Jews . . . was an insult to civilisation'.²³¹ Seeking to disseminate the progress it represented, Britain could target these conditions as a lever to raise the general state of nations. As Montefiore wrote to Gladstone prior to the latter securing Ionian Jews equality in January 1859: 'Any amelioration in the status of the Jewish inhabitants of the islands cannot fail to enure to the welfare of the whole people, and advance the general progress of civilisation.'²³² Where the French might sponsor indigenous Catholic groups, or the Russians patronize native Orthodox Christians, the British government, usually bereft of a similar Protestant interest, could intervene for Jewry in the name of civilization. Pushed by an Anglo-Jewish interest group at home, the Foreign Office adopted the cause of benighted Jewish communities to advance its own and humanity's interests, which were often viewed as coterminous.

²²⁸ K. Bourne, *The Foreign Policy of Victorian England, 1830–1902* (Oxford, 1970), 112–13, 124.

²²⁹ *Parliamentary Papers* 1877, xli. 203, 250, Loftus to Clarendon, 5 Mar. 1870, and Loftus to Granville, 23 May 1872.

²³⁰ *Saturday Review*, 17 Aug. 1867, 200–1.

²³¹ *The Times*, 11 Apr. 1864, 11.

²³² University of Southampton Library MS 259, Copies of Papers of Sir Moses Montefiore, 1793–1885, Letter from Montefiore to Gladstone, 13 Jan. 1859

It was not quite ‘commerce and Christianity’ but, to a bibliocentric trading nation, perhaps the next best thing. Certainly, the protection of Jewish populations saw that, as the Board noted, ‘fortunately, the cause of humanity was coincident with the cause of commerce’.²³³ And sympathetic pockets of Jews under Western Jewish tutelage might have been thought preferable to Catholic duplicity, Orthodox barbarism, or Muslim fanaticism running rampant. In 1864, when Montefiore obtained from the Sultan of Morocco a firman granting equality to his Jewish and Christian subjects, the *Daily Telegraph* exclaimed: ‘What is Christianity, if not such deeds as his!’²³⁴ Montefiore’s mission had received official British patronage and substantial material support, including the loan of a naval frigate for transportation, which, no doubt, dramatically increased its likelihood of success.²³⁵

There was a remarkable synthesis between British conceptions and Anglo-Jewish ideals concerning the issue of Jewish relief. On his return from Morocco Montefiore was fêted at the Common Council, where he received the thanks of the corporation for ‘representing the true type of Englishman’.²³⁶ This significantly boosted Anglo-Jews’ self-perception and they confidently bought into the civilizing mission. The *JC*, too, thought Montefiore in Morocco above all else ‘a spreader of Western humanity and European civilisation’.²³⁷ For them efforts to succour foreign Jews were not simply inter-family affairs but, executed under the British flag, ‘the world-wide symbol of liberty and freedom’, became a means to enlighten all nations.²³⁸ The Anglo-Jewish Association’s work was understood in these terms: ‘its mission is to extend the light of English civilisation to the dark places of the earth.’²³⁹ In carrying out its mission Anglo-Jewry displayed the ‘cultural arrogance’ of its British contemporaries.²⁴⁰ Privileged in rights and comfort beyond most other communities, Anglo-Jewry felt duty bound to ‘become the Joseph’ of its brethren, something it undertook with a distinct superciliousness: ‘It happens from time to time that circumstances occur abroad almost imperatively demanding the fraternal—perhaps we should more justly

²³³ LMA, ACC/3121/G1/01/002, BDAR, 1880–9, Apr. 1881, 41.

²³⁴ Quoted in D. Littman, ‘Mission to Morocco (1863–1864)’, in Lipman and Lipman (eds.), *Century of Moses Montefiore*, 177.

²³⁵ *Ibid.* 188, and *The Times*, 11 Apr. 1864, 11.

²³⁶ *The Times*, 11 Apr. 1864, 11. ²³⁷ *JC*, 1 Jan. 1864, 4.

²³⁸ *Ibid.* 16 Dec. 1859, 5. ²³⁹ *Ibid.* 16 July 1880, 9.

²⁴⁰ R. Hyam, *Britain’s Imperial Century, 1815–1914: A Study of Empire and Expansion*, 3rd edn. (Basingstoke, 2002), 75.

say the paternal—intercession of the Jews of England.²⁴¹ Anglo-Jewry believed that with its successful emancipation the community had reached the pinnacle of Jewish development, which had to be diffused as an example for less fortunate co-religionists. Spreading civilization on the British model was extended to disseminating Jewish existence on the Anglo-Jewish model.

Quintessential to this effort was the inculcation of emancipatory logic, of the compromise necessary to prosper as both Jew and citizen. Montefiore's protection of Jewish rights in Morocco was coupled with a letter of advice to all congregations in the country preaching that

you must never for a moment forget the loyalty, the affection and respect due to your sovereign . . . Let neither actions nor words from you induce your fellow-countrymen of the Mohamedan faith to suppose that you are in any way unmindful or regardless of your duties as subjects . . . Over the poorer and less educated classes of our brethren in Morocco, let your watchful care be exercised so far as in you lies, so that they pay due obedience and respect to the constituted authorities; let them be patient with small annoyances.²⁴²

Uniting and overlaying both the English and Jewish impulses for this Anglo-Jewish quest to improve foreign Jews were very Victorian beliefs in the inevitability of progress and triumph of reason.²⁴³ Conscious of the possibilities of modernity—the forces granting them emancipation—Jews were no longer prepared to fatalistically accept hostility as inherent to Exilic life: 'Such a policy might have suited the dull and low period of stage-coach travelling, book censorship, monopolies, and guild privileges, when there existed no large public . . . but such a policy would little befit the age of steamboats, railways, telegraphs, free trade, and freedom of the press.'²⁴⁴ Despite the scale of the task, despite the numerous setbacks experienced, the Board and the wider community therefore maintained its efforts. They remained optimistic. Montefiore, the exemplar of Anglo-Jewry's (and, indeed, the wider British) mission, articulated this attitude most succinctly after his failure to rescue Mortara from the Papacy. As he explained to the British attaché, Odo Russell:

At all times it is difficult to penetrate the veil that hides the future from our view, but we may feel assured that the cause of civilisation, however rude the shocks

²⁴¹ *JC*, 16 Dec. 1859, 6, and 10 Nov. 1871, 9.

²⁴² LMA, ACC/3121/A/010, MBBB, 1864–71, x, 36.

²⁴³ Finestein, 'Sir Moses', 172.

²⁴⁴ *JC*, 10 Aug. 1860, 4, and S. Baron, 'The Modern Age', in L. Schwarz (ed.), *Great Ages and Ideas of the Jewish People* (New York, 1956), 330.

it may occasionally sustain, must progress, that the time cannot be very far distant when men of every creed will denounce laws, (if any such there be) that are in contravention of the Law of Nature, and when the rights of conscience will be universally acknowledged and respected, if so, however melancholy the immediate effects of the Mortara case, may this not be a link in the chain of events which under the directing eye of an all wise God are tending to mitigate individual suffering, and promote the moral, social and political condition of the human race.²⁴⁵

VI

The Board of Deputies of British Jews was a central institution in the post-emancipation community. Claiming superintendence of the minority's official interests and control of its dialogue with Gentile authorities, the Board sought to parent and police English Jewry in their first decades of equality. There had been no blueprint for Jewish existence developed during emancipation and the Board was positioned after 1858 to be a mediating factor in defining and guiding communal life. Its arrogation of responsibility for foreign brethren also witnessed the projection of these concerns onto an international level. In all of these spheres, though, the Deputies' behaviour matched neither its rhetoric nor other Jews' expectations. The proportion of the community it spoke for was not commensurate with the proportion it actually represented; a fact that considerably impaired the Board's authority. It also meant that the assembly possessed something of an anachronistic character. Representing what was a collection of individual citizens via an ascribed authority based neither upon democratic opportunity nor volitional subscription smacked of outdated corporate Jewish governance. The Deputies' stubbornly attested monopoly upon Jewish communication and petulant refusal to recognize institutions not deferent to this displayed signs of governing in a manner inappropriate to the modern age.

The Board's greatest hangover from the traditionalist conception was its attempt to regulate the tone of Anglo-Jewry's piety. The Deputies were never monolithic in their opinion: on many issues debate and dissension occurred. But an 'Orthodox brigade' composed of some of

²⁴⁵ National Archives, FO918, Russell, Odo, Papers and Correspondence, 1851–1884, Letter from Montefiore to Russell, 26 July 1859.

the most active of the assembly—Montagu, Oppenheim, Schloss, and crucially Montefiore—were able to push the agenda for much of the period.²⁴⁶ These Deputies asserted a monochromatic interpretation of Anglo-Judaism—closely backed by the ecclesiastical authorities. Using its only legal power, the licensing of marriage secretaries, the Board became a homogenizing, centralizing force within the community, enforcing mainstream Orthodoxy. This came at a price, however. The Board often appeared prejudiced in these actions, which excluded many Jews not only from its chambers but also from participation in the communal structure. Most glaringly, it was key to maintaining the outcast status of Reform Judaism long after communal opinion had become reconciled to its existence. In the emancipated age the prohibition upon Jewry's internal dissidents appeared hypocritical and damaged the Board's credibility.

The Deputies were functioning under an older understanding of Jewish identity than that possessed by the first Jewish MPs and leading emancipationists. In the domestic sphere the Deputies placed greater emphasis on preserving Jews' exceptionality from the universal requirements of modern life, as they and Montefiore had prior to emancipation. This was, though, at all times, tempered. The Deputies were not knee-jerk traditionalists: they valued their combined identity and were aware of the delicate compromise required to sustain it. Whilst they often erred slightly more towards the particularist aspect, this usually concerned rather insignificant issues, and on major areas of contention they were willing to strike a balance. Concerning marriage, for instance, the most jealously guarded of the Board's prerogatives, the Deputies accepted the loss of ecclesiastical influence over Jewish divorce without argument when informed by the Registrar General:

I regret to say that, guided by the best legal advice to which I have access, I cannot coincide in the opinion of the London Committee of the British Jews, that a marriage contracted between two persons of the Jewish persuasion, can be dissolved in England by a Jewish tribunal . . . I cannot recognise as valid a divorce, *a vinculo*, granted by the Jewish ecclesiastical board in London.²⁴⁷

Such a sacrifice, the Board understood, was the reciprocation of emancipation, of maintaining Jewry in an equal society.

The Board was even more conscious of its English identity in regard to activities on behalf of foreign Jewish communities. In this sphere

²⁴⁶ *JC*, 16 Feb. 1877, 5.

²⁴⁷ LMA, ACC/3121/A/010, MBBD, 1864–71, x. 127.

its outlook was attuned very much to the general British one. With a sense of their own status the Deputies intervened across the globe seeking to relieve their co-religionists and through them contribute to the progress of civilization. These efforts echoed British ones, and considerable interaction occurred as the Board and the Foreign Office strove for a mutual goal: the improvement of mankind through British example. English and Jewish differences were here obviated through the syncretism of progress.

These good intentions were not sufficient to rectify the plight of persecuted Jews. All the Deputies' work in this era was merely palliative, never curative. The Board overvalued its relationship with the government and was excessively cautious regarding projecting a cosmopolitan Jewishness into the international arena. More involved measures, like the long-term projects of the AIU and AJA, were not countenanced. These institutions advocated an alternative version of Jewish identity, one allowing for a more robust internationality, and the Board consequently opposed them, despite their shared aims—a misjudgement that cost it dear. Many in the community desired more prominence in foreign Jewish affairs. The British state was evidently willing to tolerate considerable Diasporic connections, as Jewish MPs had proved in Parliament, and as early as 1861 it was communicating directly with the AIU. The AJA demonstrated that a transnational Jewishness was compatible with English nationality, and turned the Board's narrow emancipatory logic upon its head by claiming leadership of international Jewish organization to complement Britain's leadership of the civilized world.

By the end of this period the Board of Deputies was not the institution it had been at the beginning. Individuals, including ex-members like Salomons, and absent ones, such as Lionel de Rothschild, pursued Jewish interests independently and often with greater success. This had from the start made a mockery of the Board's claim to officially channel communication. 'The Government of this country cares not a fig whether a grievance be distilled through the percolator of a Board kept warm by a cosy or simply an individual representation.'²⁴⁸ Appreciating this, the Board's relative importance in the community had declined still further in this era. As the *JC* criticized: 'For some decades the Board of Deputies has ceased to take the position which belonged to it as a congregational representative institution. It allowed other bodies . . . not to usurp impetuously, but to undertake unavoidably, solemn and

²⁴⁸ *JC*, 22 Sept. 1871, 9.

important functions which the Board should have fulfilled.²⁴⁹ In 1885 the Board discovered that the United Synagogue Visitation Committee, with whom it had cooperated concerning Jewish reformatory inmates in 1873, was directly discussing new arrangements with the Home Office. When the Board requested that such negotiations proceed through it, the Committee rejected the idea as a 'retrograde step', it having been for some years 'the practice of the Visitation Committee to approach the various public bodies to whom it may have occasion to address itself upon matters concerning its working and it has always received the utmost consideration at their hands'.²⁵⁰ On the foreign front the Board also lost out, conceding its monopoly through the CFC. After emancipation the Board had been a central, if not crucial, communal institution; by the mid 1880s it was falling increasingly to the periphery. In later decades, revitalized by increased provincial presence and a new generation of members, the Deputies would regain something of their importance, but at the end of this period much, if not all, of their work could be, and increasingly was being, undertaken by other organizations or individuals. The Board had persisted with an interpretation of Jewry's place in life (and its role within Anglo-Jewry) that was constructed pre-emancipation; the world, meanwhile, had moved on. Its vision of Anglo-Jewish existence was no longer relevant to the majority of the community or the surrounding society by the 1880s.

²⁴⁹ Ibid. 3 Apr. 1874, 89.

²⁵⁰ LMA, ACC/3121/A/012, MBBB, 1878–89, xii. 368. A similar dispute with the Jewish Board of Guardians had occurred earlier in 1877; the Guardians informed the Deputies they had been taking independent action in the public sphere since 1871.

4

Faith and Form

Anglo-Jewish Religion

I

In February 1868 the *Jewish Chronicle* lamented the disorganization of Anglo-Jewry's synagogal system. Commenting that synagogues were the 'only real communal centres' of Anglo-Jewry, the newspaper feared this neglect endangered elements of its solidarity.¹

It should be carefully remembered that a synagogue differs from a church or chapel in respect of the nature of the service to which it is devoted. A synagogue is not a house for the reading of prayers by one or more ministers only; it is a house of instruction; and . . . it is a house of assembly likewise.²

Religious practice and faith education were of fundamental importance to Anglo-Jewry's group existence. These factors had always been essential in maintaining and transmitting Jewish identity: the lack of any corporate dimension to the community after Resettlement meant that membership was associational and, therefore, had to be carefully preserved and perpetuated. But they assumed especial importance in the post-emancipation age. Jews were not only equal citizens, participating in all aspects of society and exposed to ever more non-Jewish influences, but, according to the rhetoric and understanding of emancipation, after 1858, the confessional sphere was the one space within which Jews could express their particularity—to operate as a distinctive subculture. Ostensibly, religion would be the only quality defining the Jew as Jew. Examination of the religious state of the minority—in terms of organization, practice and beliefs, and the associated issue of denominational education—is therefore crucial to the study of Anglo-Jewish identity in

¹ *JC*, 7 Feb. 1868, 4.

² *Ibid.* 8 Oct. 1869, 8.

the period 1858–87. The nature of Jewish existence in Britain should be most clearly exposed here: the extent of religious acculturation, the types of religious institution, the depths of religious belief, the rationale underlying Jewish education, the role of religious inculcation within this, all reveal how the community viewed, understood, expressed, and desired to continue being Jewish, and their capacity to do so, in modern Britain.

Fortunately for Jewry, if Britain was an industrial, urban nation, it was also a remarkably religious one.³ Among the Victorian upper middle classes Sunday church attendance and formal prayer constituted recognized properties of life.⁴ Biblical criticism and anthropological theories alike had little impact upon devotion till the end of the nineteenth century, and if the working masses were never fully convinced, they prompted the various Christian denominations to undertake impressive measures of reorganization, expansion, and modification in efforts to gain and sustain allegiances.⁵ This atmosphere encouraged notions of religious identity, which could justify adherence to Judaism. More problematically, the British religious milieu was robustly Christian, in both ethos and practice: state and society were ordered around and upon Christian, more specifically Protestant, values. There had been foreboding prior to emancipation that civil equality in such an environment might compromise aspects of Jewish faith or practice, and religious leaders throughout the period were moved to remind Jews that it should not. *Haham* Benjamin Artom urged in 1866: 'We are citizens, and let us by all means act as good citizens; but, we must not forget that we are Jews also; nay, Jew before all—above all other titles and qualifications.'⁶ The Chief Rabbi echoed more sternly in 1874: 'Do not say that you have other duties to fulfil to your country and therefore you cannot be Orthodox Jews.'⁷ This was the Orthodox establishment's line on emancipation in Britain: that it was possible to be a dutiful participant in the majority Christian culture and to loyally remain part of a cohesive Jewish minority.

³ J. Obelkevich, 'Religion' in F. Thompson (ed.), *The Cambridge Social History of Britain, 1750–1950*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, 1990), iii. 311.

⁴ T. Endelman, 'Communal Solidarity among the Jewish Elite of Victorian London', *Victorian Studies*, 28/3 (1984–5), 503.

⁵ Obelkevich, 'Religion', 329.

⁶ University of Southampton Library, MS 116/94, Small Jewish Collections, B. Artom, 'The Duties of a Jewish Pastor in the Present Age', a sermon delivered on the occasion of his installation as *Haham*, 16 Dec. 1866, 13.

⁷ *JC*, 4 Sept 1874, 360.

To supervise British Jews' religious identity and prevent the feared 'revolt from tradition' experienced by many continental communities during the emancipation age, Anglo-Jewish leaders relied upon a unique version of Jewish religious organization, the central construct of which was the Chief Rabbinate.⁸ A hierarchical and centralized institution, the Chief Rabbinate provided Anglo-Jewry with one exclusive authority to decide all matters relating to Judaism in modern Britain. S. Sharot has termed this system 'mono-rabbinism', for the Chief Rabbi was officially the only rabbi in Britain. All other Jewish religious officials were prohibited from using the title and were predominately limited to performing non-rabbinic roles.⁹ Such deviation from traditional Jewish models was designed to act as a centripetal force, helping to secure the institutional hegemony of Orthodox Judaism.¹⁰ There was no *Yeshiva* in Britain to offer variant opinion; the Chief Rabbi presided over the *Beth Din* and through the *Shechita* Board exercised control over the provision of ritually slaughtered food.¹¹ Operating in tandem with lay authorities, the religious monopoly of the Chief Rabbinate was used to maintain communal cohesion—it cooperated, for instance, with the Board of Deputies to prevent splits within provincial congregations.

The Rabbinate's principal partner in this endeavour and significant Anglo-Jewish organization in its own right was the United Synagogue (USyn). Formally constituted in January 1871, this institution integrated the main metropolitan Ashkenazi synagogues into an overarching structure, which coordinated finance and procedure with the object of 'maintaining, erecting, founding, and carrying on, in London and its neighbourhood, places of worship for persons of the Jewish religion'.¹² It proved an effective vehicle for the lay elite to regulate and control the community, whilst also responding to and directing its expansion. Although Parliament, which had to approve the United Synagogue Scheme because it amalgamated several charities, refused to establish any compulsory Jewish authority by forcing a wording alteration

⁸ S. Singer, 'The Anglo-Jewish Ministry in Early Victorian London', *Modern Judaism*, 5/3 (Oct. 1985), 279.

⁹ S. Sharot, 'Religious Change in Native Orthodoxy in London, 1870–1914: Rabbinate and Clergy', *JJS* 15/2 (Dec. 1973), 167.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* 168, and T. Endelman, *The Jews of Britain, 1656–2000* (London, 2002), 120.

¹¹ A. Hyamson, *The London Board of Shechita, 1804–1954* (London, 1954), 29.

¹² LMA, ACC/2712/13/01/059, USP, United Synagogue Deed of Foundation and Trust, Jan. 1871, 2.

proscribing the endorsement of a specific ecclesiastical head, the USyn founders agreed that, in practice, this would be the case: 'the Scheme shall be read and construed as if . . . the words, "the maintenance of the Chief Rabbi, and of the Ecclesiastical Board"', were substituted for the words "the maintenance of a Chief Rabbi and of other Ecclesiastical persons"'. The foundation of the United Synagogue cemented the minority's highly centralized and powerful religious structure, where authority was vested in a set of interlocking institutions that cooperated to supervise most aspects of the Jewish communion and prevent alternative versions of faith from arising.

This peculiar Anglo-Jewish religious establishment was a reaction to the modernization of European society. Like most other English denominations, Jewish authorities sought to retain relevance in an industrially developed, increasingly democratic, and increasingly secular environment. But for Anglo-Jews, it seems there was another motivation: acculturation. Their ecclesiastical establishment was not merely a response to modernity but a specifically English product of it. It is generally received historiographical opinion that the community consciously modelled its organization upon that of the Anglican Church: that its institutions were, in part, overt measures of Anglicization. By 1880, Geoffrey Alderman claims, the USyn appeared, as it sought to portray itself, 'to be the Jewish branch of the Anglican establishment',¹³ with the Chief Rabbi occupying 'a position of authority somewhat parallel to that of the Archbishop of Canterbury'.¹⁴ Some historians, such as Israel Finestein and M. Goulston, portray this as a natural adaptation to the dominant pattern, noting that the respectable and inclusive, yet well-organized and disciplined nature of the Church appealed to Orthodoxy's needs and provided a successful example of ecclesiastical structure.¹⁵ Other historians have adopted more sceptical conclusions. S. Singer discusses the loss of Jewish identity occasioned by religious assimilation—the 'internalisation of Protestant values . . . to such an extent that they [the Jewish elite] were only able to view their faith in British Protestant terms'.¹⁶ These

¹³ G. Alderman, 'English Jews or Jews of the English Persuasion? Reflections on the Emancipation of Anglo-Jewry', in P. Birnbaum and I. Katznelson (eds.), *Paths of Emancipation: Jews, States, and Citizenship* (Chichester, 1995), 154.

¹⁴ Sharot, 'Rabbinate and Clergy', 171.

¹⁵ See I. Finestein, 'The Anglo-Jewish Pastorate (1840–90)', in idem, *Anglo-Jewry in Changing Times: Studies in Diversity, 1840–1914* (London, 1999) and M. Goulston, 'The Status of the Anglo-Jewish Rabbinate, 1840–1914', *JJS* 10/1 (June 1968).

¹⁶ Singer, 'Anglo-Jewish Ministry', 282, 287.

strands of interpretation echo the wider historiographical contention within Anglo-Jewish history between those historians, such as Todd Endelman and William Rubinstein, who emphasize the comparative benignity of Anglo-Jewry's experience and those, such as Bill Williams or David Cesarani, who more critically appraise the situation and focus upon the assimilatory nature of British toleration.¹⁷

The study of Jewish religion and its corollaries constitutes an extremely important part of this debate. The remarkably Anglicized version of Judaism developed in Britain, alongside the community's lack of religious education, would at first seem to support the more condemnatory critique. But a subtler examination moderates this viewpoint. The transformation of the Anglo-Jewish religious system, concerned, for a start, with practice and form—rather than doctrine or belief—was never fully implemented in practice. Optimist and pessimist historians alike, possibly distracted by the rhetoric of contemporary leaders, seem to have overestimated its popularity among the wider community, which at times favoured, and towards the end of the period begin to reassert, more traditional methods. It should be remembered, too, that there was little pressure, direct or indirect, from outside encouraging these alterations. Anglo-Jewry in these spheres largely self-acculturated, selecting those elements that most appealed to their composite identity. Also, at times English models provided marked benefits, such as facilitating group preservation. Appreciated in these contexts, the religious state of the community reinforces the contention that, despite inevitable change and loss of distinction, Anglo-Jewry existed in an essentially benign environment. But as this chapter illuminates, the situation was fluid and never that simply demarcated. Issues changed over time, affected different Jews differently, had multiple ramifications within the community, echoed wider currents of activity, and might be seen as separatist or acculturative depending upon viewpoint. Ambiguity and ambivalence, as always, dominated the community's existence.

¹⁷ See Endelman, *Jews of Britain*; W. Rubinstein, *A History of the Jews in the English-Speaking World: Great Britain* (New York, 1996); B. Williams, 'The Antisemitism of Tolerance: Middle-Class Manchester and the Jews, 1870–1900', in A. Kidd and K. Roberts (eds.), *City, Class and Culture: Studies of Social Policy and Cultural Production in Victorian Manchester* (Manchester, 1985); and D. Cesarani, 'British Jews', in R. Liedtke and S. Wendehorst (eds.), *The Emancipation of Catholics, Jews and Protestants: Minorities and the Nation State in Nineteenth Century Europe* (Manchester, 1999).

This chapter concentrates primarily upon the religious component.¹⁸ Detailing the nature of the community's religious organization through the developments that occurred, as well as investigation of the motivations, popularity, and consequences of these, it initially assesses the institutional nature of communal religiosity and its identity implications. Evaluating the nature of Anglo-Jewish religious practice—showing how it adapted to its modern situation as a British confession and the loss of traditional faith this entailed—the chapter proceeds to an essential determiner of this: religious education. Investigating the split between particular and general tuition of Jewish youth, this section reveals the existence of notable class differentiations within the community, as well as a general deficiency of faith instruction. The final section of the chapter addresses topics that demonstrated continuing religious feeling and group identity—out-marriage, proselytizing, conversion—before moving on to examine issues influencing the dualistic character of the group—connections to the Holy Land, Restorationism, concepts of the Jewish Mission. Concerning the latter case this chapter, building upon the conflation of British and Jewish interests communal MPs and institutions achieved, suggests that religiously, Anglo-Jewry managed to enhance these efforts to create a fully integrated identity.

II

'A red letter day in the Anglo-Jewish Calendar' was how the *JC* described 4 December 1870, the day members of five metropolitan synagogues assembled for the first time to elect representatives to the United Synagogue.¹⁹ After four years of negotiations, the union of the oldest English synagogues had been realized. Preliminary meetings had been held with an enthusiasm the *JC* found 'difficult to describe' and voter turnout for the initial election, where some vestry rooms were 'literally

¹⁸ Some of the most extensive and best preserved communal records concern Anglo-Jewry's religious state. Many institutions have left substantial archives, many containing excellent information in the form of correspondence, reports, and minutes. Collections that are used throughout this chapter include those of the Chief Rabbinate, United Synagogue, various individual synagogues, Jews' College, and the Jews' Free School. These records are supplemented by the considerable number of printed sources concerned with this area of Jewish life: sermons and tracts, for instance.

¹⁹ *JC*, 9 Dec. 1870, 10.

thronged' by voters and most were at least 'well filled', indicated the popularity of the measure.²⁰ Despite this interest, the USyn did not establish a conclusive form of religious organization within Anglo-Jewry. For a start, it did not include all London synagogues and no provincial ones at all. A variety of opinions continued to be expressed among Anglo-Jews regarding the most appropriate religious system for their community. The congregation of the Western Synagogue were long-time dissentients. Refusing to adhere to USyn guidelines, they purchased a separate cemetery in 1880 and allowed other synagogues similarly unwilling to submit to the 'petty exclusiveness' of the central authorities to use it: 'The result has been that the ground at Edmonton has served as a cemetery for the members of the Federation, Finsbury Park, South-East London, North-West London, and Hackney Synagogues. . . . The Western afforded them facilities for the use of their burial ground, whilst enabling them to preserve their independence.'²¹ The impressively centralized structure of Anglo-Jewry was by no means monolithic.

Neither was it always popular among its constituents. An 1879 letter from 'T.' deplored the dominance of the Chief Rabbi: 'We are living under a hierarchy equally despotic as the papacy.'²² It was not an isolated expression. Such dissent was at times significant enough to provoke rebuke from the *JC*: 'we desire deliberately to protest against a growing feeling of restiveness to, or restlessness under, lawful authority. Such restiveness is likely to lead to anarchy, and therefore to that disunion which is fatal.'²³ But dissatisfaction appears to have been endemic, if often more low-lying. An unflattering indication of the Chief Rabbi's popularity was revealed by an 1871 report, which discovered that twenty-one provincial and fifteen colonial congregations under his supervision had never contributed to his maintenance fund, whilst four metropolitan, nine provincial, and one colonial had recently ceased to do so. As a result, his office could only cover expenditure through 'incessant solicitation'.²⁴ Even the *JC*, staunch supporter of

²⁰ *JC*, 24 Apr. 1868, 4, and 9 Dec. 1870, 10–12.

²¹ A. Barnett, *The Western Synagogue through Two Centuries (1761–1961)* (London, 1961), 212. The term 'petty exclusiveness' is part of the bias against the Chief Rabbinate evident in Barnett's work; it has been used here, however, in this knowledge, because it still addresses a valid point. For the rest of the quoted material see M. Levy, *The Western Synagogue: Some Materials for its History* (London, 1897), repr. in C. Roth, *Records of the Western Synagogue, 1761–1932* (London, 1932), 188.

²² *JC*, 1 Aug. 1879, 4–5.

²³ *Ibid.* 17 May 1872, 97.

²⁴ LMA, ACC/2712/02/001, USP, Report of the Chief Rabbi's Board, 1 May 1871, 38.

the establishment, admitted a desire for modification. 'It [the Chief Rabbinate] is an institution which exactly suits the temper of English Jews, with their moderate views and their love of union', but 'the ecclesiastical authority, as at present constituted, does not satisfy the requirements of the age. . . . The ecclesiastical authority needs reconstruction.'²⁵

The paper's comment indicates that such grumbling was more than mere chafing against centralized power. A modernizing urge was still apparent in elite Anglo-Jewish attitudes during this period. The creation of the USyn was partly a product of an ongoing desire to improve religious structures, particularly by increasing their relevance to modern conditions. The nature of adjustments desired and the discussions these generated are thus good indicators of Anglo-Jewry's religious state; as the following example from an 1876 USyn Council debate demonstrates well. Initiated by Nathan Adler's request that the Council appoint a new *dayan* upon the retirement of the previous incumbent, this meeting quickly degenerated into an argument upon the very necessity of the ecclesiastical authorities, as the proposal met fierce opposition. Noah Davis suggested it was unnecessary to appoint a successor: 'he thought that most of the litigation which came before the court [*Beth Din*] would not have arisen but for the existence of the court.' N. S. Joseph, architect, social worker, and brother-in-law of Hermann Adler, supported him, claiming that:

the 'religious functions', such as he understood appertained to the office of *dayan*, had at all times been most mischievous. These rabbis had taken injunctions found in rabbinical literature of nearly two thousand years ago and tried to make them applicable to the everyday life of the present time. These functions had been discharged in a manner which had done far more harm than good.

Algernon Sydney and Lionel Cohen countered that such resistance was 'inopportune', as the 73-year-old Adler, to whom the community bore a responsibility, had requested this assistance. The motion to provide a successor was just carried, 11 to 10, alongside a resolution that the Council confer with Adler to restrict the *dayan's* functions.²⁶ The elite's conception of themselves as modern English Jews is clearly apparent here. The open hostility to an ancient ecclesiastical position suggests there was slim identification with or sympathy for such facets of Jewish

²⁵ *JC*, 18 Apr. 1884, 9.

²⁶ *Ibid.* 28 Apr. 1876, 104.

tradition that no longer seemed relevant to life in nineteenth-century Britain.

Not all Anglo-Jews were so alienated. The appointment, after all, proceeded; and some, like L. London and Samuel Montagu, appalled at the attack upon centuries of tradition, defended the *dayanim*. Most Jews, though, to some degree, concurred with this disparagement. Lionel Cohen, for instance, whose support for the motion was motivated not by principle but personal considerations, speaking after Davis and Joseph, had stated that he 'quite agreed with much that had been expressed'.²⁷ The *JC* pushed a similar line. The 'antiquated system' of the *Beth Din*, it candidly announced,

bears no relation whatever to the religious life of English Jews . . . what is wanted nowadays is a more liberal interpretation of Jewish law than the *Beth Din* in its existing form is inclined to give. The present ecclesiastical authorities have lost touch of the wants and feelings of the age . . . Government by the triumvirate of the *Beth Din* was well enough in former times when ceremonialism was at its zenith, and the purely spiritual requirements of the community were of a very unexact order. But the times have changed, and ecclesiastical authorities ought to change with them.²⁸

In this period, Anglo-Jewry was consciously rejecting aspects of its Jewish heritage, even though emancipation had guaranteed equal civil respect for Judaism. Calls for modification, for the religious organization to parallel the understandings of the community, naturally resulted. The aforementioned 'T.' suggested Anglican Convocation and nonconformist assemblies as potential models; the *JC* from the early 1880s began advocating the formation of a Jewish synod presided over by the Chief Rabbi.²⁹ It is instructive of Anglo-Jewry's self-image, or desired self-image, that their chosen replacements bore a markedly English impress. The British community was acculturated to the point that, to a remarkable degree, it could better relate to religious structures founded upon British (and therefore Christian), rather than Jewish, conceptions.

It was not only their religious organization that Jews sought to update. Similar sentiments were evinced towards Anglo-Jewish ritual. There was talk of needing to improve Orthodox worship. 'There can be no doubt that there are parts . . . which are no longer in harmony with the communal intelligence or ethical standard, which are redolent of superstition, and which, justly so, are liable to misconstruction.'³⁰

²⁷ *JC*, 28 Apr. 1876, 104.

²⁸ *Ibid.* 18 Apr. 1884, 9.

²⁹ *Ibid.* 1 Aug. 1879, 4, and 29 Dec. 1882, 10.

³⁰ *Ibid.* 12 Oct. 1877, 9.

The *Jewish World* similarly hoped for the removal of ‘objectionable passages . . . which are at variance with the educational advancement of the present day’.³¹ There were evidently concerns amongst the image-conscious minority about appearing recondite—both to themselves or, more seriously, outsiders. But there was more behind these demands than image projection. Fundamentally, they reflected developments within Anglo-Jewish identity. Aspects of traditional ritual now had little relevance for the acculturated community and were generating tension between their Jewish and their modern, Anglo-Jewish identity. The *JC* bemoaned the ‘consciousness of this dissonance in our innermost being’.³² Free and equal citizens, Jews no longer wanted a faith bearing the marks of persecution and the ghetto. Not all Jews felt this way, of course; there were some who rejected any alterations outright as irreligious. But the majority of the community were in favour, and in 1879 and again in 1882, the USyn arranged conferences to modify the ritual. These were attended by all constituent synagogues, save the ultra-traditional Hambro, with the intention of instituting changes that would reconnect Jews to their faith without offending traditionalists.³³ The *JC* felt such a balance had been achieved after 1879:

The Chief Rabbi has, happily, been able to steer a middle course between the scheme of the conference and the rigid *non possumus* of the ultra-Orthodox party. He has conceded a great deal of what has been asked of him; but he has withheld sufficient to conciliate those who would have him part with nothing.³⁴

Simeon Singer, Reverend of New West End Synagogue and model Anglo-Jewish minister, codified the incremental liturgical changes of the post-emancipation era in his 1890 revised *Authorised Daily Prayer Book of the United Hebrew Congregations of the British Empire*.³⁵ Endorsed by Nathan and produced by Hermann Adler, Singer’s prayer book incorporated the developments of the past thirty years: new prayers were adopted for various *rites de passage* relevant to modern society and popular in Christian worship, whereas most *piyyutim* for special Sabbaths and festivals, along with various kabbalistic elements and references

³¹ *JW*, 28 Mar. 1879, 5.

³² *JC*, 12 Oct. 1877, 9.

³³ See LMA, ACC/2712/02/001–2, United Synagogue, Agendas and Presented Papers, 1870–80 and 1881–5.

³⁴ *JC*, 25 June 1880, 9.

³⁵ *The Authorised Daily Prayer Book of the United Hebrew Congregations of the British Empire: With a New Translation by Rev. S. Singer* (London, 1890).

to bodily functions, were deleted or euphemistically translated.³⁶ The work, felt too moderate by some in the community but too traditional by others, formalized Anglo-Jewry's balanced approach to ritual adaptation: 'Its aim has been to unite accuracy and even literalness with due regard for English idiom.'³⁷

Such restrained compromise was to be the hallmark of Anglo-Judaism. There was a willingness to enact non-ideological alterations, so long as they did not transgress the boundaries of Orthodox law.³⁸ As the 1879 conference report indicated:

Judaism should never be viewed as fossilised in its forms. . . . like everything else of human design, the outward forms of our religious service must of necessity be liable to change occasionally, with change of times and circumstances. Such alteration of form, when guided in a cautious, reverential, and conservative spirit, is one of the clearest signs of a vitality which is the best safeguard and guarantee for the preservation of Judaism.³⁹

It was a method of advance the community had picked up from their environment. Noting the national impressions particular societies made upon Judaism, Anglo-Jewry realized their adaptations were part of, and subject to, wider currents in the British religious situation.

Although by its conception of God, man's relation to Him, and the tenets imposed by Him on His people, Judaism forms a religious system quite distinct from that of any other nation . . . it has nowhere altogether escaped the prevailing influences of the countries in which its followers are scattered. . . . in Germany it is rationalistic, learned and ingenious; in France it is superficial, impulsive and indifferent; and in our England grave, practical, conservative and unlettered. No wonder, therefore, that the agitation in the Church, called forth by the relation of the Book of Common Prayer to the clergy, should also find its counterpart in the synagogue. Not that the latter imitated the former but that one and the same cause . . . set them both in motion.⁴⁰

Such was Anglo-Judaism: a faith sufficiently integrated to share reforming concerns with the Established Church but one that had, unlike

³⁶ S. Reif, *Judaism and Hebrew Prayer: New Perspectives on Jewish Liturgical History* (Cambridge, 1993), 284–6.

³⁷ *Authorised Daily Prayer Book*, p. viii.

³⁸ S. Sharot, 'Religious Change in Native Orthodoxy in London, 1870–1914: The Synagogue Service', *JJS*, 15/1 (June 1973), 67.

³⁹ LMA, ACC/2712/02/001, USP, Report to the Boards of Management of the synagogues represented at the conference of delegates to consider modifications in the service of the synagogues, 760.

⁴⁰ *JC*, 13 June 1862, 4.

some European communities, eschewed radical acculturation to environmental forms of Christian practice, and rather transformed gradually, maintaining an accommodating balance that provided continuing relevance for various intensities of Jewish worship.⁴¹ One group that would not have felt included within Anglo-Judaism, however, were Eastern European immigrant Jews. Increasing in numbers throughout this period, these Jews would have a revolutionary impact upon Anglo-Jewry from the 1880s onwards, as Chapter 5 explains. Until then, generally more traditional than native Jews, the immigrants exhibited hostility to the acculturated faith of USyn and preferred to worship outside communal institutions in their own small societies, or *shtiebel*.⁴²

These post-emancipation revisions brought Anglo-Jewish Orthodox worship closely in line with British Reform Judaism. Not only in practice but also in rationale the two increasingly inhabited the same territory. The rancour of the 'schism' having largely abated, a rapprochement occurred and communal commentators began remarking from the late 1860s onwards that 'the separation has now become almost nominal'.⁴³ This was facilitated on one side by Reform's lack of further innovation.⁴⁴ As Israel Zangwill, journalist, writer, and communal observer, commented in 1892, the Berkeley Street congregation was 'a body which had stood still for the past fifty years admiring its past self'.⁴⁵ The increasing receptivity of Orthodoxy to adjustment was, however, the greater facilitator. Disgruntled Orthodox believers certainly thought this to be the case. Haim Guedalla, nephew of Moses Montefiore, criticizing calls to alter rabbinical authority, advised the disaffected to join Reform, warning that 'unless a bold stand be made, they will actually be the more Orthodox Jews. Indeed, everything since 1840 has been but miserable copies of their actions.'⁴⁶ Guedalla's opinion was not that of fringe ultra-Orthodoxy but represented a significant section of communal opinion, which, while the *JC* debated 'reconciliation', remained

⁴¹ Sharot, 'Synagogue Service', 67.

⁴² G. Alderman, *Modern British Jewry*, 2nd edn. (Oxford, 1998), 142.

⁴³ *JC*, 13 Aug. 1869, 13.

⁴⁴ For example see University of Southampton Library, MS 140/6/18, West London Synagogue of British Jews Records, Report of a sub-committee to consider the mode of introducing portions of the prophets into the Sabbath service, 1879, which discusses proposals for service modification encountering 'great divergence of opinion' and therefore being dropped.

⁴⁵ Quoted in A. Kershen and J. Romain, *Tradition and Change: A History of Reform Judaism in Britain, 1840–1995* (London, 1995), 28.

⁴⁶ *JC*, 29 July 1870, 3.

resolutely hostile to Reform. Moses Montefiore was the most high-profile exponent of this unforgiving hard line, employing his influence to ensure Reform's long exclusion from the Board of Deputies.⁴⁷

Despite this notable discontent interaction increased; developing, on the whole, smoothly and through practical action rather than contrived philosophical harmonization—as always was Anglo-Jewry's way. Calls for reunion may have been optimistic but they were also unnecessary, given the intimate level of cooperation achieved between the separate groups. This had begun in earnest by the second half of the 1860s, with Professor David Woolf Marks, first (and founding) minister of Reform, testifying in defence of the Chief Rabbi's monopolistic control over *Shechita*, which had once been directed against his own flock, during an 1868 trial.⁴⁸ By 1887, incidences were manifold: ministers were invited to preach at each others' services; Reform contributed £50 per annum to Jews' College; another £50 was gifted to USyn's Burial Society and the congregation was represented on its committee; and by 1886, they elected representatives to the Deputies.⁴⁹ By the end of the period the two bodies were operating symbiotically in many spheres of communal governance and were closer than at any time since they separated. Indeed, if the formation of USyn be included, it might be considered that the outward level of communal cohesion

⁴⁷ Montefiore's intransigence was heartfelt and extended into his personal life. Writing to his estranged, seriously ill brother Horatio, a Reformer, Montefiore expressed gladness at his supposed recovery but hoped this would serve as a lesson of his error: 'I am most happy to learn that you are gradually improving in strength—I am sure you must be grateful, for at no time is man's heart so filled with gratitude for all God's mercies as on rising from a bed of suffering to a new life, I greatly hope . . . given you by the mercy of the God of Israel may lead you to seek his Divine help to bring you back to the ancient faith of your fathers and to the love and union of family ties.' Horatio died shortly afterward. University of Southampton Library, MS 259, Copies of Papers of Sir Moses Montefiore, 1793–1885, Letter from Moses to Horatio, 23 May 1867.

⁴⁸ *The Times*, 15 Dec. 1868, 10. The case *Schott v. Rev. Dr. Adler* was brought by an immigrant Jew in possession of a foreign licence to sell kosher meat. Schott had opened a butcher's shop in Whitechapel against the order of the ecclesiastical authorities, who had wanted him to operate in the Islington area after obtaining a licence from them. When their directions were ignored, Schott was called before the *Beth Din*, his produce declared *trepha*, and these actions advertised amongst the Jewish public. Schott challenged the Chief Rabbi's authority to impose such conditions. The Court found in favour of Adler, concluding that the matter was an internal religious one.

⁴⁹ LMA, ACC/3121/G1/01/002, BDAR, 1880–9, Apr. 1886, 15–16; LMA, ACC/2712/02/002, USP, Report of the Executive Committee concerning representation on the Burial Committee of congregations contributing towards the cost of burial of the poor, Nov. 1883, 196; and *JC*, 22 Jan. 1886, 9.

was greater in this period than in any other since the seventeenth century.

One particular area of post-emancipation devotion in which Orthodoxy followed a similar pattern of development to Reform was the widespread institution of pulpit preaching. Reform had included a sermon as a regular feature from the establishment of its first synagogue in 1842.⁵⁰ Although English sermons were offered in Bevis Marks from 1833, uptake was initially sporadic among the wider community.⁵¹ By the achievement of emancipation, however, they were fast becoming a necessary feature, and most major synagogues built in this period, the so-called 'Cathedral Synagogues' because of their architectural similarities to these Christian buildings, featured prominently placed pulpits.⁵² In the decades after 1858 most important religious leaders extolled the essentiality of sermons within Jewish services, often espousing highly idealized perceptions of their usefulness. In 1866, *Haham* Artom enumerated what he thought sermons accomplished:

From the Pastor's lips the truth must go forth to his flock, and it is from the pulpit that he has to declare it to the faithful . . . teaching men the ordinances of faith, and the precepts of civil life; teaching men their duty to their neighbour, and to the fatherland which is so dear to them . . . From his lips as the congregation throng silently around him, must flow words of advice, admonition, reproof, and warning, and words of hope, comfort and promise!⁵³

Enthusiasm for sermons continued into the 1880s, the Boards of Management of Bayswater and New West End Synagogues concluding after investigating whether to institute a 'rotation of preachers' 'that the preponderating desire of the members of each synagogue was for sermons every Sabbath'.⁵⁴ This reflected the prominence and popularity of preaching in most British Protestant services at this time, a fact that has led some historians to highlight Anglo-Jewry's passion for sermonizing as a major sign of their religious acculturation: Singer, for instance, finds it one of the more blatant attempts to: 're-fashion Judaism in

⁵⁰ A. Hyamson, *Jews' College, London, 1855–1955* (London, 1955), 16.

⁵¹ Singer, 'Anglo-Jewish Ministry', 284.

⁵² S. Kadish, 'The "Cathedral Synagogues" of England', *Jewish Historical Studies*, 39 (2004), 70.

⁵³ University of Southampton Library, MS 116/94, Small Jewish Collections, Artom, 'Jewish Pastor', 16 Dec. 1866, 16.

⁵⁴ LMA, ACC/2712/BWS/005, UPS, Bayswater Synagogue Minute Book, 1873–90, Report on the proposed system of circuit preaching, by conjoint meeting of Central, Bayswater and New West End, 5 July 1883.

the Protestant mould'.⁵⁵ Sermons were certainly a significant aspect of British Jews' religious Anglicization. Artom's speech displays considerable internalization of Christian themes and terminology. But the depth to which such sentiments penetrated the community at large is debatable and seems to have been overestimated by current historiography, intent either, like Singer, to illustrate the abandonment of Jewish tradition or construed more positively, like Finestein, to demonstrate Jewish integration. Finestein claims that 'by 1880 residual inhibitions about sermons had waned into remote memory or distant paternal hearsay'.⁵⁶ Such statements miss the significant disparity that existed between elite rhetoric and communal reality in regard to preaching.

Though they broke no halachic rule, the fact that sermons were viewed as un-Jewish is evident from the attempts religious leaders made to justify their Hebrew heritage. In 1892, Hermann Adler, delegate Chief Rabbi from 1880, Chief Rabbi 1891–1911, was still trying to convince the community: 'The minister should regard himself as the lineal successor of the greatest of all preachers, the prophets of old.'⁵⁷ Moreover, there is much evidence that the sermon, with its overtly didactic purpose, did not suit the religiosity of all Anglo-Jews. Letters in the *JC* from 1861 through to 1880 criticized sermons. 'Jacob' suspected that his fellow congregants were bored by sermons, 'the thin attendance, made thinner' by them.⁵⁸ 'A Simple Worshipper' 'read with great disappointment the summaries of sermons delivered during the past few weeks', being 'pained to see the endless iteration of the same verbose platitudes, and the attempt to stretch or mutilate old superstitions to meet the procrustean tests of modern thought'.⁵⁹ Such opinion was not isolated, the paper itself noting in 1882 that the Great, New, Hambro, Borough, and East London congregations had no regular preachers and received perhaps only four sermons a year.⁶⁰ The top rank of religious leaders and their more acculturated followers thought the Jewish sermon a necessity. Using their influence and playing upon emancipation tendencies they sought to impose this opinion upon the congregations. These were less convinced. As time passed and the novelty wore off, communal opinion expressed its dissent and the installation of preachers became less

⁵⁵ Singer, 'Anglo-Jewish Ministry', 286.

⁵⁶ Finestein, 'Anglo-Jewish Pastorate', 73.

⁵⁷ H. Adler, *The Functions of the Jewish Pulpit* (London, 1892), 9.

⁵⁸ *JC*, 24 May 1861, 6.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.* 1 Oct. 1880, 4.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.* 15 Dec. 1882, 9.

important as more traditional practices re-emerged. No less a person than Lionel Cohen expressed the resentment some felt against the preaching emphasis with scathing comments during an 1883 USyn meeting:

If the question be divested of sentimentality and the opinions of the congregations could be tested, it would be found that among the regular attendants at synagogue, the majority would if necessary dispense with the sermon . . . He himself would rather hear a service at which Hebrew was read correctly than any number of sermons. The one was essential, the other a luxury. And yet he and those who agreed with him were told they belonged to a past age . . . A great mistake was committed in attaching a preacher to an individual synagogue. No one could stand 52 weekly sermons by the same man.⁶¹

The rise of the sermon was part of the evolution in character and duties experienced by the Anglo-Jewish religious office over the nineteenth century. It was one of the more important aspects of attempts to professionalize and Anglicize the Anglo-Jewish ministry, the motivation behind which was, again, the need of the integrated Jew to modernize his community. 'We have at last arrived at a stage when the Jew rivals his neighbour in science and the arts, in civic matters, and enlightened zeal for his religion. One factor in this moral revolution has undoubtedly been, and must continue to be, an enlightened, fully cultured, and zealous clergy.'⁶² Besides any rabbinical accomplishments, the *JC*'s requirements for Jewish clergymen 'added the possession of a pleasant, strong and easily modulated voice, the manners and expressions of a gentleman, and an acquaintance with society and the world'.⁶³ To produce these urbane rabbis, the minority's seminary, Jews' College, placed as much emphasis upon secular as religious instruction, and its students were required to matriculate at UCL.⁶⁴ The College, echoing wider desires, placed great emphasis upon obtaining officials commensurate in class to their congregants. In 1880 it was sadly

⁶¹ Ibid. 12 Jan. 1883, 6. Cohen was a dedicated communal worker and prominent member of the Jewish elite. President of the Jewish Board of Guardians 1869–87, he was one of the men most responsible for the formation of USyn, of which he was a Vice-President.

⁶² LMA, ACC/2712/02/001, USP, Jews' College Memoir, 509.

⁶³ *JC*, 8 Aug. 1873, 316.

⁶⁴ LMA, ACC/2712/02/001, USP, Jews' College Memoir, 512. Besides theological subjects, students regularly learned English literature, history, geography, arithmetic, geometry, moral philosophy, chemistry, Latin, Greek, French, and German.

observed that of the fifteen boys training for the ministry all had parents of 'limited circumstances'.⁶⁵ USyn warned of

the urgent necessity which exists of providing fitting men to perform the duties of Jewish ministers . . . and not longer to subject the community to the dangerous hazard of drawing, from the Jewish public, men who may feel no calling for the profession which perhaps the poverty of their parents in the first instance selected for them.⁶⁶

Even more important than status was nationality. Being British topped the list of desiderata for an Anglo-Jewish minister: 'We need men capable of fulfilling ecclesiastical functions who have received their education in England, from an English point of view—men of English birth and English rearing and men of English academical training are assuredly needed.'⁶⁷ Such men were required not only to reflect their congregants' identities but to competently undertake the increasing tasks expected of a Jewish minister. These were adopted from the concept of the Protestant pastoral ministry, which had become so important a part of the nineteenth-century Christian clergyman's role.⁶⁸ Hermann Adler preached that 'the clergy must be first and foremost in this goodly work of visiting the poor in their homes'.⁶⁹ The USyn in 1871 stipulated 'that the visitation and religious supervision of Jewish inmates of workhouses, asylums, hospitals, reformatories, and prisons . . . should be committed to the Jewish ministry in an organised and defined system'.⁷⁰ Such functions bore little resemblance to traditional rabbinic responsibilities, which concentrated more exclusively upon providing halachic interpretation. These were now being devalued by the community, who looked to their Christian neighbours for modern forms of religious guidance.

The highly acculturated ideal was never realized. Geoffrey Alderman's assertion that under Hermann Adler a situation was almost reached in which 'Anglo-Jewish clergymen were clergymen who happened to be Jewish' overstates the case and, as with preaching, confuses the exemplar—clothed in Anglican-esque garb, self-entitled 'very Reverend', and

⁶⁵ LMA, ACC/2712/02/001, USP, Report of the Committee appointed 3 July 1877 concerning the training of Jewish Ministers, 504.

⁶⁶ Ibid. 505. ⁶⁷ *JC*, 15 Jan. 1875, 672.

⁶⁸ G. Parsons, 'Reform, Revival and Realignment: The Experience of Victorian Anglicanism', in idem (ed.), *Religion in Britain*, 5 vols. (Manchester, 1988), i. 27.

⁶⁹ H. Adler, *The Purpose and Methods of Charitable Relief: Two Sermons Preached at the Bayswater Synagogue* (London, 1884), 10.

⁷⁰ LMA, ACC/2712/02/001, USP, Report of Committee on the general administration of relief, Apr. 1871, 19.

talking of the Jewish ‘communion’—with the general situation.⁷¹ The character of most Jewish ministers was far less acculturated and accomplished than their head. The hoped-for Anglicization, for one thing, was not achieved in this period. Jews’ College, whose Principal was foreign, was unable to produce sufficient native candidates of quality to satisfy demand.⁷² Despite stipulating a good knowledge of English as a prerequisite, the Great Synagogue’s advertised vacancy for a first Reader in 1871 was answered by fourteen foreigners and only four Englishmen; Revd M. Hart of Breslau was hired.⁷³ By 1884, the New Synagogue had dropped the language requirement, ‘it having been brought to the attention of the board that a much better class of applications will be received if this qualification is not made essential’.⁷⁴ Even less success was met in raising the socio-economic class of officials. An 1877 USyn report into the training of Jewish ministers was forced by their continuing low status to ponder: ‘Are there any special circumstances in connection with Jewish Orthodox practice which prevent members of the upper or middle class from becoming candidates for the Jewish ministry?’ Concluding negatively, the report believed the only discouragement that could be thought of was ‘the want of sufficient inducement’.⁷⁵ Here was the real problem facing the post-emancipation clergy. For while expectations and responsibilities had increased, respect and remuneration had, tellingly, not. An 1873 USyn confidential report candidly admitted as much: ‘the fact is patent that since the appointment of most of these officers their duties have, in nearly every instance, increased, while their salaries represent—in purchasing power—a considerably smaller sum; in other words the salaries have been gradually diminishing.’⁷⁶ Training facilities were permanently underfunded throughout the period. Jews’ College lamented that it could not muster £300 per

⁷¹ Alderman, ‘English Jews’, 153.

⁷² Hyamson, *Jews’ College*, 33. From 1865 the college Principal was Michael Friedländer, a German Pole from Berlin. On this point it was also notable that the two religious heads of the community, Chief Rabbi Adler and *Haham* Artom, were not English, being German and Italian, respectively.

⁷³ LMA, ACC/2712/GTS/007, USP, Great Synagogue Minute Books, 1870–1937, entry for Jan.–June 1871.

⁷⁴ LMA, ACC/2712/02/002, United Synagogue Agendas and Presented Papers, 1881–5, 255.

⁷⁵ LMA, ACC/2712/02/001, USP, Report of the Committee appointed 3 July 1877 concerning the training of Jewish Ministers, 507.

⁷⁶ LMA, ACC/2712/02/001, USP, Report of the Executive Committee to consider and report on the salaries of all officials, 1873, 174–5. Letters of complaint from Reform ministers indicate that clerical impecuniosity was a community-wide phenomenon: see

annum in subscriptions: 'the result, it must be assured, argues a singular want of appreciation on the part of the wealthiest Jewish community in Europe.'⁷⁷ Unsurprisingly, this did not produce the pastoral clergy some hoped for: 'I have to admit with shame and humiliation', commented Hermann Adler, 'that many of our ministers are very remiss in the performance of this duty.'⁷⁸

Not all in the community were similarly bothered. The Hambro Synagogue had never accepted the new standards and would employ Talmudic scholars and qualified rabbis as its readers.⁷⁹ The modest resurgence of sympathy for traditional forms detectable in the early 1880s in regard to sermons also saw a certain rehabilitation of older conceptions of religious officials. The benefits of the *hazzan*, a cantor-like official whose main duties involved Hebrew rendition, were again touted. In 1882, Liverpool Old Synagogue deliberately passed up the opportunity to appoint a preacher, preferring instead to employ a foreign-born *hazzan*, whose ability, according to the *JC*, 'to discharge ministerial duty is simply nil'.⁸⁰ E. A. Franklin, banking partner and brother-in-law of Samuel Montagu, the next year obtained sympathy from a USyn meeting in which he expressed veneration for 'old-fashioned *chasonos*'.⁸¹ This sentiment should not be exaggerated. Many still looked with a degree of contempt upon such nostalgia; at this meeting Maurice Hart claimed Anglo-Jewry deserved better than a 'singing bird in a white cravat'.⁸² But there was some quality in the *hazzan* that persistently appealed to Anglo-Jewry. Their more emotional and musical roles were consonant with contemporary Christian enthusiasm for hymnody; and, more in tune with English Jews' religiosity that was seldom intellectual enough to appreciate rigorous preaching, but primarily expressed through Hebrew usage, their participation also represented a specifically Jewish devotion.

For all its integration the community could not fully accept the image of a clergy so alien to its tradition. Even the progressive *JC* recognized this: 'It seems to us that too much stress has been laid on the necessity of having a Jewish clergy in a sense analogous or

University of Southampton Library, MS 140/1/24, Correspondence with Ministers of the Synagogue, 1864–70.

⁷⁷ LMA, LMA/4180/JC/B/01/001, Jews' College Minutes and Annual Reports, 1874–9, Annual Report, 1878, 10.

⁷⁸ Adler, *Purpose and Methods*, 10.

⁷⁹ Singer, 'Anglo-Jewish Ministry', 283.

⁸⁰ *JC*, 15 Dec. 1882, 9.

⁸¹ *Ibid.* 12 Jan. 1883, 6.

⁸² *Ibid.* 6.

parallel to the clergy of the Church of England.⁸³ The idea of a 'Jewish clergy' was, after all, an artificial one. Many of the pastor's duties were executed by the laity in Jewish communities. The synagogue was governed by laymen, not ecclesiastics. 'We Jews are . . . remarkably sensitive as to interference from the priesthood, and from time immemorial the Minister has occupied his office solely as long as he conformed to the will of his congregation.'⁸⁴ In this situation the Anglo-Jewish ministry developed as a hybrid; a blend of Jewish and English ideas. Stripped of traditional legal roles, expectations of religious officials had been substantially acculturated, but without a concomitant alteration in the religious culture they were deprived of the position of respect Christian clerics enjoyed, whilst understated appreciation for customary Jewish roles continued. In reality, the Anglo-Jewish clergy was a confection.

This was the situation of mainstream Anglo-Judaism in London. Conditions in provincial communities, where approximately a third of Jews resided, were markedly different. The post-emancipation state of many of these, excluding the larger industrial cities, such as Manchester, Liverpool, and Birmingham, was not uplifting. Numerically small and precariously financed, their religious standard bore slim resemblance to the rhetoric issuing from the ecclesiastical authorities. Paul Hirsch, President of the Great Synagogue in Leeds, replied to Hermann Adler's suggestion that he employ a preacher in 1886: 'I am afraid judging from past experiences that the majority of our Leeds community are not only indifferent to the benefits of proper religious instruction and preaching but positively hostile to it.' He was willing to try, however, if, of course, sufficient donations could be obtained from the capital.⁸⁵ A similar enquiry at Leicester brought equally disheartening news: 'in the course of a few years Judaism in Leicester will be a thing almost entirely unknown. At the present time it has reached its lowest ebb we have nothing but indifference and discord.'⁸⁶ The issue in many communities, it seems, was not modernization of Judaism but its survival.

It is notable that in this effort local figures cooperated with and sought assistance from the central London authorities. The archives of the Chief Rabbinate are replete with correspondence requesting aid or seeking

⁸³ *Ibid.* 8 Aug. 1873, 316.

⁸⁴ *JW*, 30 May 1879, 5.

⁸⁵ LMA, ACC/2805/02/01/098, Chief Rabbi's Office, Correspondence: Miscellaneous, 1886, Letter from Hirsch to H. Adler, 16 Mar. 1886

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, Letter from Leicester Congregation to H. Adler, 15 July 1886.

advice, provincials evidently recognizing the institution's jurisdiction. There is evidence, however, that, whilst recognized, this prerogative was seldom effective on the ground. In 1884, for instance, the *Beth Din*, investigating a conflict within the Canterbury congregation, resolved that the sacked Revd Rosenberg be reinstated. The congregation's President conveyed his 'surprise and discontent' with the verdict to Adler, alongside a thinly veiled threat of financial consequences:

You are aware also of the slender resources of our congregation and the chief burden of its support has laid [*sic*] upon my shoulders for many years past and how totally inconsistent it is to me to retain the services of a man who is not worthy of any support. . . . I do not wish to set my face upon him in Canterbury again.⁸⁷

The writ of the Chief Rabbi ran only so far as local lay supporters allowed. In congregations poor in both terms of organization and money, the influence of wealthy patrons could be near dictatorial. This often contributed to the fractiousness that plagued much provincial Judaism.

Interneine fighting in the Hull congregation, as two factions and various individuals quarrelled over synagogue honours, defied Chief Rabbinate and USyn intervention for over two years. In the interim it crippled services and demoralized the congregation.⁸⁸ 'Our meetings are rarely held without disturbances, insults are the order of the day, it has even reached the climax by an assault of an aggravated character at one of the committee meetings. . . . The leading men of the congregation have quite deserted us,' the secretary informed Adler.⁸⁹ The squabble severely damaged the Jewish reputation among locals. The *Hull Packet*, reporting in June 1878 on the 'wrangles of the pugilistic Jews' following the issue of a summons by one congregant upon another for alleged insult during a service, evaluated the case:

If we are to believe him, it is the custom of some of the brethren to talk to each other during the prayers. At what should be the most impressive portion of holy worship, discussions on going to Goole, Berlin, beating wives, are quite common, interlarded with such choice epithets as villain, fellow, &c, and the possibility of going to an Irish fair.⁹⁰

⁸⁷ LMA, ACC/3400/02/01/025 London *Beth Din*, Clerks to the Court: J. H. Taylor and Predecessors, 1855–1948, Letter from Hart to Adler, 19 July 1884.

⁸⁸ See various letters in LMA, ACC/2805/02/01/02, Chief Rabbi's Office, Correspondence: Hull.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, Letter from Hermann Bush to N. Adler, 25 Dec. 1877.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, Clipping from the *Hull Packet*, 21 June 1878.

The newspaper urged respectable Jews to quickly resolve the dispute: 'the thoroughly conscientious Jew has the sympathy of all right-thinking, non-bigoted men, when by the act or acts of unworthy sons of Israel, the oldest religion in the universe is trailed in the dust.'⁹¹ The Hull community was perhaps worse than most but the state of provincial Jewish religion was generally quite ignoble, if not squalid. The *JW* of April 1876 feared that if improvements were not quickly made 'and if the present causes of deterioration continue, many provincial houses of prayer will soon be extinct'.⁹²

Jewish standards varied in London, of course. But strong lay governance was here allied to well-organized ecclesiastical authority, ensuring that the types of Judaism observed across the city were better regulated and more consistent. There still existed, it would seem, though, serious deficiencies in the religious condition of many London Jews. Post-emancipation there was little idea of secularism within the community and most Jews remained nominally associated with their religion.⁹³ What the communal elite feared was indifference. The *JC* had been criticizing 'indifferentists' since emancipation and by 1867 was denouncing the 'lamentable religious ignorance in the Anglo-Jewish community'.⁹⁴ It was appreciated that these were challenging times for religion in general and that Judaism was not alone afflicted. Artom preached in 1866 against the 'reflective spirit' and 'terrible doubt' of the era; whereas the *JC* emphasized that 'ours is, by way of eminence, the age of excitement and pleasure hunting'.⁹⁵ The generality of the phenomenon was cold comfort, however, to a minority ostensibly defined by its faith only. For Anglo-Jewry, religious detachment presented a much more serious threat to their existence than it did for many English Gentiles, and the extent of communal indifference reveals much about the Jewish aspect of their identity.

This was apparently unconcerned with many matters of rabbinic doctrine, which seemed not only irrelevant but often absurd in the modern age. The *JC* enumerated in October 1882 a number of Sabbath laws forsaken *de facto* by many and that it wished to see forsaken *de jure*, including such prohibitions as carrying an umbrella on the Sabbath and

⁹¹ Ibid. ⁹² *JW*, 28 Apr. 1876, 4.

⁹³ S. Sharot, 'Secularisation, Judaism, and Anglo-Jewry', *A Sociological Yearbook of Religion in Britain*, 4 (London, 1971), 134.

⁹⁴ *JC*, 12 Feb. 1858, 68, and 11 Jan. 1867, 5.

⁹⁵ University of Southampton Library, MS 116/94, Small Jewish Collections, Artom, 'Jewish Pastor', 11, and *JC*, 30 Nov. 1865, 4.

using rail travel to attend the synagogue.⁹⁶ So prevalent was disregard for these injunctions that Gentiles noticed it. *Blackwood's Magazine* observed in 1868 that 'even among the strictest of their party tea is made and drunk on the Sabbath, though most of their Continental brethren would indignantly repudiate the practice'.⁹⁷ Whilst there can be few greater indications of how quintessentially British was Anglo-Jewry's religious laxity, Singer, commenting from a Jewish perspective, suggests the community possessed 'a neo-Karaitic unwillingness to accept restrictions which were all of rabbinic origin'.⁹⁸ Accurate as this understanding is, it cannot entirely explain communal indifference; for there were also worrying incidents of negligence concerning more fundamental traditions. In 1883 the Board of *Shechita* was concerned at declining kosher consumption, there having been 1,213 fewer beasts slaughtered kosher compared to the previous year. With the community increasing in numbers, these figures 'must be taken to show that a diminishing number of persons pay respect to the dietary laws'.⁹⁹ Adler was disturbed enough by cases 'of Jewish parents who have, in flagrant disregard of our Law, abstained from having the rite of *Milah* performed on their sons' that he requested USyn bar them from privileged membership.¹⁰⁰

Sabbath desecration was a particularly widespread problem. Whilst some type of formal observance remained *de rigueur* for the Jewish elite, as it did for their Christian counterparts, for the middling and lower strata regular attendance was generally uncommon.¹⁰¹ The problem was a nationwide one: the *JW* of April 1876 carried complaints concerning the 'truly awful disregard of the Sabbath' in Liverpool, for instance.¹⁰² Some comfort was taken from festival attendance, which continuously remained high, but 'on the Sabbath, only the

⁹⁶ *JC*, 20 Oct. 1882, 9.

⁹⁷ 'The Jewish Reformation and the Talmud', Nov. 1869, *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, 106 (July–Dec. 1869), 545–6.

⁹⁸ S. Singer, 'Jewish Religious Observance in Early Victorian London, 1840–1860', *JJS* 28/2 (Dec. 1986), 126. Singer perhaps invests this phenomenon with too much theological significance: Anglo-Judaism was not a philosophical faith and its approach to alteration was pragmatic. Nevertheless, the point that Talmudic knowledge was held in low regard by Anglo-Jews and its injunctions widely evaded is valid.

⁹⁹ *JC*, 20 July 1883, 4.

¹⁰⁰ LMA, ACC/2712/02/001, USP, Report of the Sub-Committee appointed to prepare a draft code of by-laws for the constituent synagogues, Mar. 1878, 498.

¹⁰¹ T. Endelman, *Radical Assimilation in English Jewish History, 1656–1945* (Bloomington, Ind., 1990), 82, 94–5.

¹⁰² *JW*, 21 Apr. 1876, 2.

pious and the observers of ceremonies unite'.¹⁰³ A religious survey of attendance within 'smaller London' undertaken by *St James's Gazette* in November 1881 included synagogues and discovered that out of an approximate 9,150 seats, only 2,790 were occupied during the Sabbath service—some 30.5 per cent.¹⁰⁴ Neglect of traditional rites was augmented by disregard for modern, Anglicized requirements. Imposing decorum upon the customarily boisterous Jewish service, for instance, was perhaps the most important alteration sought by religious authorities, who viewed it as necessary demonstration of Judaism's respectability. It was another modification never satisfactorily achieved. *JC* editorials and correspondence throughout the period perpetually lambasted 'sights which you would not see in either church or chapel—viz., people sitting, standing, lolling, in all sorts of positions; we also frequently see the snuff box passed round from its owner to his neighbours; we see people laughing, smiling, chatting'.¹⁰⁵ In 1876 the Chief Rabbi was obliged to issue a circular to all synagogues reprimanding congregants for the 'reprehensible scenes' that disturbed Yom Kippur that year.¹⁰⁶

It would seem, then, given the indifference evinced toward both traditional and Anglicized practice, that significant sections of Anglo-Jewry were not merely detached from rabbinical Judaism but far more seriously irreverent, if not irreligious. The elite themselves realized this in regard to their poorer brethren. Lionel Cohen raised a motion at an October 1884 USyn meeting 'to call attention . . . to the spiritual destitution existing among the Jewish poor of the

¹⁰³ M. Angel, *The Law of Sinai and its Appointed Times* (London, 1858), 364. Rosh Hashanah (New Year) and Yom Kippur (the Day of Atonement), were noted as exceptionally popular, witnessing overflowing synagogues and necessitating temporary extra accommodation.

¹⁰⁴ Reported in *British Weekly: A Journal of Social and Christian Progress*, 12 Nov. 1886, 2.

¹⁰⁵ *JC*, 14 Feb. 1868, 3. There is an issue of source prejudice here. It is a feature of historical evidence that controversies and concerns are regularly mentioned and highlighted, whereas 'normality' often escapes notice as contemporaries had no cause to record it. The potential for exaggeration in these circumstances is thus great, particularly for emotive issues such as religion. Care must be taken to avoid investing such sources with undue influence. They can still, of course, be immensely useful—they still provide information on the past—particularly in cases such as this, where instances occur continuously over a time period and a variety of other evidence exists to contextualize and reinforce the source.

¹⁰⁶ LMA, ACC/2712/02/001, United Synagogue Agendas and Presented Papers, 1870–80, 294.

metropolis'.¹⁰⁷ Like their Christian countrymen, Jews had difficulties spiritualizing the working classes; something caused, at least in part, by religious institutions designed without them in mind. 'A poor Jew' angrily complained in the *JC* about being forced to 'squat' in the seat of an absent gentlemen and being ejected on his occasional arrivals; 'why, then, should I be shut out entirely from publicly joining in the worship of God at the most solemn time of year merely because I have the double misfortune to be poor and religious?'¹⁰⁸ High seat rentals and the ranking of congregants by wealth were issues repeatedly debated in religious discussions of the time, but no significant resolution was achieved.

'A poor Jew's' letter, though, hinted at another problem: the lack of religious engagement of the higher classes—his gentlemen that only visited upon holidays. The *JC* worried that wealthy West-Enders, those driving many reforms, were declining in spirituality. It described their innovation of a divided service with sarcasm: 'It commences a little after ten o'clock, thereby allowing for the late rising of the west-enders, for their having a suitable breakfast, and for then, in their morning leisure, paying the great compliment of attending the synagogue to praise the God of Israel.'¹⁰⁹ This was the paper's great fear: that for many Anglo-Jews the above transgressions indicated their faith was degenerating into '*opus operatum*'.¹¹⁰ Abraham Benisch expressed the concern in 1874: 'To a large number of Jews their religion has become a thing of mere habit. It is the outward practice and not the in-dwelling idea, which chiefly occupies their attention.'¹¹¹ It would seem a conclusion difficult to refute.

III

This Anglo-Jewish detachment was both a product and a reflection of the poor level of Jewish learning within the community. To a minority subculture participating in a state and society ordered around and permeated with alien ideals, promotion and knowledge of its own cultural and religious experiences are essential to perpetuating its specificity. Anglo-Jewry, however, accorded a remarkably low importance

¹⁰⁷ LMA, ACC/2712/02/002, United Synagogue Agendas and Presented Papers, 1881–5, 255.

¹⁰⁸ *JC*, 4 Sept. 1874, 367.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.* 13 Nov. 1874, 528.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.* 24 Oct. 1862, 4.

¹¹¹ A. Benisch, *Judaism Surveyed: Being a Sketch of the Rise and Development of Judaism from Moses to our Days* (London, 1874), 118.

to such acts and this no doubt had an adverse effect upon the state of communal religiosity. There was, for instance, a 'great decline of Hebrew knowledge'.¹¹² Despite the centrality of the language to Orthodox observance, the excellent deposits in several British libraries, and the appeals of religious leaders that it secured the 'devotional fellowship' between Diaspora Jews, Hebrew became increasingly redundant to most Anglo-Jews.¹¹³ *Blackwood's Magazine* observed in 1869: 'Most English Jews are so ignorant of the principles of Hebrew, that they would find it a very difficult and uncongenial task to read their scriptures in their own tongue. The consequence is, that anything like a careful study of them is entirely neglected.'¹¹⁴ Although the *JC*, supported by influential ministers, regularly deplored the 'barefaced perversion on the part of Anglican translators', the minority did not even possess a Jewish version of the Bible.¹¹⁵ Since the end of the eighteenth century communal intellectuals had failed to develop an alternative to the Authorized Version, which most Jews were happy to use and, by emancipation, had come to regard as standard.¹¹⁶ For many this was a measure of the acculturation of their religious-cultural values. The communal commentator 'Nemo' thought the AV, 'despite all its archaisms, the most beautiful book in the English language. It breathes the very spirit of poetry; its hold on the feelings is fascinating: its accessibility is such that its phraseology has found its way into all literature current since its rendering.'¹¹⁷ For the majority, it would also seem to have resulted from a more general adaptation: the assimilation of the utilitarian British nature. 'All the treasures of Judaism are buried in books written in Hebrew; and because Hebrew, as a language, has little to recommend it to the utilitarian, the study of it is neglected.'¹¹⁸

This was always the case with Anglo-Jewry, for whom the abstract and intellectual were generally seconded to the concrete and functional: a situation that led not only to a lack of specifically Jewish learning but to a general dearth of cultural contributions. Anglo-Jewry, from both English and Jewish perspectives, was a 'cultural backwater'.¹¹⁹ The

¹¹² *JC*, 8 July 1864, 4. ¹¹³ *Ibid.* 14 Aug. 1868, 5.

¹¹⁴ 'Jewish Reformation', *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, 548.

¹¹⁵ *JC*, 29 June 1862, 2.

¹¹⁶ D. Ruderman, *Enlightenment in an English Key: Anglo-Jewry's Construction of Modern Jewish Thought* (Oxford, 2000), 219–21.

¹¹⁷ *JC*, 24 Dec. 1869, 9.

¹¹⁸ Angel, *Law of Sinai*, p. v.

¹¹⁹ N. Cohen, 'Non-Religious Factors in the Emergence of the Chief Rabbinate', *TJHSE*, 21 (1962–7), 309.

community admitted this; otherwise quite self-assured, if not arrogant, this realm saw them concede inferiority to other Jewish communities.

We unhesitatingly maintain that the palm of rare knowledge and superior education must be awarded to the Jews of central Europe, especially those of Germany. Compared with them the Jews of England lag far, far behind. . . . We have, no doubt, in England a number of well-educated Jewish ladies and gentlemen. Some can even boast of scholarly attainments; but we unhesitatingly declare that both quantitatively and qualitatively they are excelled by any second-rate Jewish community in Germany.¹²⁰

Unlike their Central European brethren, English Jews had no appreciation of knowledge for its own sake, no craving for the virtues of *Bildung*.¹²¹ But in Britain these were not necessary. Taking their lead from the English bourgeois environment, Anglo-Jews did not need to achieve a high degree of cultural or educational proficiency to demonstrate their acculturation, as German Jews felt beholden to do.

The community's approach to educating its youth was predicated upon this rather perfunctory attitude to learning. Anglo-Jewry had a well-developed denominational schooling system by the post-emancipation era. In 1860 the *JC* estimated that 'out of 6,000 children, some of whom must be too young for school, whilst others must have outgrown it, 3,204 are actually found within the walls of our educational establishments'.¹²² Most Jewish schools in London had good academic records. No less an inspector than Matthew Arnold praised the Westminster Jews' Free School for girls and boys: 'The rate of failure is very trifling in both, but far more uncommon than a low rate of failure is the intelligence, accurate knowledge, and clear speaking which are found here. I have never inspected a school where they are surpassed, very seldom had one where they are equalled.'¹²³ Due to its excellent results the Jews' Free School (JFS) was awarded the largest government grant per head of child ever attained in 1884.¹²⁴ For all this, however, these

¹²⁰ *JC*, 2 Dec. 1864, 3.

¹²¹ *Bildung* expresses an idea of cultural and moral attainment by individuals through self-improvement of character; something that was a goal in itself but could also enable useful contributions to wider society. In early nineteenth-century Germany, where it became the mark of bourgeois society, it shaped a new social identity, the *Bildungsbürgertum*, to which many Jews sought to acculturate. See M. Meyer, 'Becoming German, Remaining Jewish', in *idem* (ed.), *German-Jewish History in Modern Times*, 4 vols. (New York, 1997), ii, 200.

¹²² *JC*, 10 Feb. 1860, 4.

¹²³ *Ibid.* 13 Apr. 1883, 5.

¹²⁴ University of Southampton Library, MS 153, Report of the Jews' Free School, 1884 (London, 1885), 13.

schools failed to imbue Jewish youth with more than a rudimentary grasp of their religion. The practicalities of integration got in the way again. 'The admission of the once secluded Jew into the general society of the civilised world has wrought a change . . . Hebrew is now no more than one of the branches of education which engage the time and attention of Jewish youth. A limited number of hours each week . . . is all that can be spared for its study,' noted the *JC* in 1866.¹²⁵

So relaxed was the communal approach to religious instruction that the schoolbooks used in its institutions were not always Jewish oriented. Despite recurrent press criticism of this 'urgent religious want', the communal elite were often not sufficiently concerned to produce an alternative to standard Christian ones.¹²⁶ This led to incidents that more responsible parents found 'very disgraceful': 'It has come under my notice that the Manchester Jewish school allows children to take books home . . . my own boys had a book entitled the "Child's Geography", giving the history of Christ, and all his miracles and performances . . . it is really deplorable that in our schools such blunders should be committed.'¹²⁷ If the approach of Jews towards educating the next generation is symptomatic of their attitudes towards a desirable identity, the Anglo-Jewish schooling system indicates a disregard for serious religious commitment.¹²⁸ A notable exception to this general remissness was the *hadarim*. These small, often one-room, after-school organizations were a prominent feature of immigrant districts, where they were established to ensure a traditional education for these more pious Jews' offspring. Of varying quality, imparting only religious rather than secular knowledge, and staffed by foreign teachers, the *hadarim* were frowned upon by the established community, who perceived them as a barrier to integration.¹²⁹

Communal education also reveals the crucial importance the Jewish elite invested in the English, class-conceived aspects of their identity. For these schools were not designed to inculcate religion. The separate Jewish schooling network was maintained in this era primarily for the purposes of disciplining, occupying, and 'improving' the Jewish poor. Moses Angel, long-term headmaster of the JFS, explained his school's

¹²⁵ *JC*, 16 Nov. 1865, 4.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.* 9 Aug. 1861, 4.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.* 31 May 1861, 6.

¹²⁸ S. Singer, 'Jewish Education in the Mid-Nineteenth Century: A Case Study of the Early Victorian London Community', *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 77/2-3 (Oct. 1986-Jan. 1987), 163.

¹²⁹ Endelman, *Jews of Britain*, 146.

purpose to the commissioners enquiring into the state of popular education in England in 1861 thus: 'A very large number of the Jewish poor in this district habitually receive charity; as a principle they beg least who are best educated.'¹³⁰ The school's report the previous year had been more candid:

Many children who would have wandered idly about the streets, devoid alike of religion and knowledge, and who might easily have been ensnared in courses of vice and infamy, were, by means of this institution, instructed in their religious duties and the elementary branches of knowledge, and were thus trained to become respectable and useful members of society.¹³¹

For this reason communal schools were munificently funded in this period. The *JC* thought the financial state of Jewish education 'very satisfactory' and superior to that of most Christian equivalents.¹³² This pecuniary support was not derived from the whole community. As early as 1860, the Committee of the JFS was regretting a fall in annual subscriptions, noting it relied upon voluntary offerings at the anniversary dinner to recoup a £1,200 deficit.¹³³ Four years later this situation had deteriorated: of the school's £3,500 annual expenditure only £465 was covered by its subscription list.¹³⁴ Such contributions would have come, in large part, it might be assumed, from the Jewish middle to lower classes, and their paucity suggests a lack of interest from these groups. Consequently, Jewish schools relied upon the largesse of elite sponsors and were, therefore, organized according to their interests, foremost among which was the superintendence of the poor, and particularly the significant foreign section of this, ever present during the period due to constant Jewish immigration into the East End. Communal considerations were intermixed with this task. Anglo-Jewry's image would be generally raised if its poorer sections could be instilled with social responsibility, steered toward gainful employment, and kept from criminality; and the achievement of this within a distinctly Jewish system, where Jewish children associated exclusively with other Jewish children and were taught at least the basics of their religious responsibilities,

¹³⁰ *Parliamentary Papers*, 1861, xxi, Report of the Commissioners Appointed to Inquire into the State of Popular Education in England, 74.

¹³¹ University of Southampton Library, MS 153, Photocopy of Report of the Jews' Free School, May 1860, 7.

¹³² *JC*, 10 Feb. 1860, 4.

¹³³ University of Southampton Library, MS 153, Photocopy of Report of the Jews' Free School, May 1860, 10.

¹³⁴ *JC*, 27 May 1864, 4.

undoubtedly did much to reinforce their minority identity and prevent defection in a socio-economic class Victorian Britain traditionally found hard to evangelize. But the underlying imperative was class. Jewish denominational schools existed to educate the Jewish lower classes. The generational transmission of Judaism was merely one facet of this task. Attempts to alter this and inject a more religious tone into communal schooling signally failed. Nathan Adler overcame fierce internal opposition to open Jews' College School in 1855, with the intention of offering middle-class children a solid Jewish education. A deficiency of financial support, reflecting widespread indifference to its intentions, forced closure in 1879; at no time in between had attendance approached his modest target of one hundred.¹³⁵

The children of the Jewish middle and, more especially, upper classes were to receive, on the whole, an education in mixed schools. That is, they were sent to mingle with the rest of the population in general English institutions, where the tradition and ethos were religiously Christian. The argument in favour of such schooling had gained dominance among communal opinion prior to emancipation, and its integrative logic—the need of Jews to demonstratively participate as equal Englishmen—still resonated strongly afterwards. The *JC* warned in 1884 that ‘there may be disadvantages rising out of exclusively Jewish middle-class schools. It is not desirable that the barriers which separate the Jew from his Christian neighbour should be needlessly multiplied.’¹³⁶ Aside from interactive opportunities, mixed schooling offered Jews an excellent forum to justify their newly attained equality and obtain a fillip to their self-confidence.

We feel that when our youths who are engaged in an intellectual struggle with their young fellow countrymen of other creeds and races, carry off trophies of merit, the honour is not theirs alone; it belongs to all Israel. Their renown reflects lustre on the community to which they belong. . . . The name of Jew is no longer a bye-word of scorn in the public school. It is a name of honour and respect.¹³⁷

Anglo-Jewish participation in general schooling, increasing throughout the period as educational provision did and as public schools began

¹³⁵ I. Finestein, ‘Anglo-Jewish Attitudes to Jewish Day-School Education, 1850–1950’, in idem, *Scenes and Personalities in Anglo-Jewry, 1800–2000* (London, 2002), 58. Bill Williams has identified a similar situation in Manchester, where the original free communal school, the Manchester Jews' School, was devoted exclusively to lower-class, foreign children. See B. Williams, *The Making of Manchester Jewry, 1740–1875* (London, 1985), 330.

¹³⁶ *JC*, 1 Aug. 1884, 9.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.* 7 Aug. 1868, 4.

creating specifically Jewish houses, served to reinforce the Englishness of their identity, exposing them to Victorian values and encouraging them to think of themselves as English.¹³⁸ It simultaneously reduced the religious strength of their Jewish identity. The *JC*'s gossip columnist was warning by 1860: 'The Christian Dame school, the Christian governess, and the Christian day-school, and, alas, I should have to add, the Christian boarding-school, but too often totally obliterate every vestige of Jewish training.'¹³⁹

This situation was not rectified. The Jewish Association for the Diffusion of Religious Knowledge, a perpetually underfunded organization, cautioned in 1878 that there were many board schools in London, largely attended by Jews, where no arrangement was made for supplying appropriate religious instruction.¹⁴⁰ Some of the middle-class community did seek to mitigate this by sending their children to after-school or Sabbath-school religious classes, whilst some of the more affluent hired private religious teachers, and for most families important life-cycle events still connected children to some religious practice and learning.¹⁴¹ However, that this trend for general schooling represented a weakening of religious stricture amongst Jews was even noted even by *Blackwood's Magazine*:

As to education—there are no places of instruction for Hebrew children except a few free schools for the poorer sort. The consequence is, that they all go to Christian schools, where the sons of rabbis are able to be seen mingling freely with pupils whose very presence at such a time ought, on their own principles, to be pollution.¹⁴²

It was also lamented within the community, where more astute commentators attacked the fundamental motivation for this situation: social aspiration. A *JC* correspondent railed in 1867:

Why are our boys sent to Christian schools? They do not find there the facilities for acquiring a greater knowledge of their own language and religion [than] our schools offer, or that could be derived from private tuition. We say a *better* education is to be had there, and by a *better* education we mean knowledge

¹³⁸ Endelman, *Jews of Britain*, 99. Clifton College, Bristol, was the first school to open a Jewish house in 1878. It was followed by Harrow in 1880.

¹³⁹ *JC*, 17 Feb. 1860, 2.

¹⁴⁰ University of Southampton Library, MS 157, Jewish Religious Education Board Papers, Minute Book of the Executive Committee, with annual reports, 1878–87.

¹⁴¹ G. Cantor, *Religious Responses to Modernity and the Sciences in Britain, 1650–1900* (Oxford, 2005), 61.

¹⁴² 'Jewish Reformation', *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, 551.

of mathematics, the modern and dead languages . . . the very religious liberty we enjoy, unless carefully looked to, may be the mine wherewith to spring the Jewish constitution; what torture could not accomplish, ambition may.¹⁴³

English class-oriented thinking decided Anglo-Jewry's educational strategies in the post-emancipation decades and this caused the prioritizing of temporal over spiritual instruction, in preparation for temporal over spiritual gains in adult life.

IV

Laxity should not be confused with loss. The problems of observance and education featured prominently in communal discourse because most Jews retained at least a titular affiliation to their religion and remained within the pale. Their lapses were therefore more apparent than would have been the case had they completely deserted the community and abandoned their Jewish identity. As with the Victorian middle class in general, Jews generally maintained a high level of congregational affiliation.¹⁴⁴ The impressive turnout for the first USyn elections has been noted already. Similar enthusiasm was evident at the apportionment of seats for newly opened synagogues. At the New Central in 1870 'the rush to secure seats was remarkable. From ten o'clock till half-past two or three, numerous ladies and gentlemen arrived in the building, and the executive had hard work to accommodate the multitude of claimants.' Five hundred seats were taken in this time.¹⁴⁵ Such positive indications of religiosity gave hope to the devout among the Anglo-Jewish elite. The stoutly Orthodox Montagu, highlighting the 'thronged synagogues' during festivals, thought: 'even in England prosperity, the direst foe to Jewish observance, has not alienated any very large numbers of Jews.'¹⁴⁶

Augmenting this general phenomenon of attachment were more specific instances of religious enthusiasm, foremost among which was the multifaceted interest many Jewish women took in their faith. From the beginning of the period, the *JC* noticed greater female synagogue attendance: at the reopening of Bevis Marks 'the large area of the synagogue was not quite filled, but the ladies' gallery was well-attended'; and at the reopening of West London Synagogue 'the area

¹⁴³ *JC*, 5 July 1867, 2. Emphasis in original.

¹⁴⁴ Sharot, 'Secularisation', 132.

¹⁴⁵ *JC*, 18 Mar. 1870, 8.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.* 22 Sept. 1882, 3.

of the sacred building was tolerably well filled . . . The ladies' gallery, however, was very full.¹⁴⁷ Impressed with their devotion, the newspaper hoped women might redeem male indifference: 'let the Jewish feeling of our women be a counterpoise to the un-Jewish spirit occasionally animating our men.'¹⁴⁸ In certain areas women were at the forefront of promoting Judaism. Michael Galchinsky has noted that female Jewish writers, women such as Grace Aguilar, Charlotte Montefiore, and Anna Maria Goldsmid, produced most of the minority's (admittedly limited) literary works.¹⁴⁹ Of the fifteen voluntary Sabbath-school teachers working in the JFS, thirteen were women.¹⁵⁰ The activities of the Ladies Committee of the Jewish Board of Guardians, in visiting the poor to impart moral guidance, were repeatedly lauded.¹⁵¹ Women also played a modest, if growing, part in defending the faith. 'A Daughter of Israel', in reaction to its publication of a critical sermon, wrote to *The Times* defending Judaism's humanity in comparison to Christianity's; in 1863 a conversionist journal spoke with irritation of the 'rich Jewish ladies' who zealously combated their East End mission.¹⁵²

The vitality and importance of female faith was appreciated by leaders across the religious spectrum. Professor Marks thought 'the attempt to train the rising generation in the fear of the Lord will prove utterly hopeless, unless the women take the leading part in the good work'.¹⁵³ Much later, Hermann Adler extolled the Jewish woman: 'She gives the needy what money cannot purchase, and what is indeed beyond money's worth, *heart-service*, willing, personal help, the ministry of holy compassionate love, sisterly and motherly help.'¹⁵⁴ This praise, however, revealed the circumscribed orbit of activity religious leaders still expected women to inhabit; their ascribed roles remained what they had traditionally been, primarily educational or philanthropic.

¹⁴⁷ *JC*, 30 Sept. 1859, 5. ¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.* 7 Sept. 1860, 4.

¹⁴⁹ M. Galchinsky, *The Origin of the Modern Jewish Woman Writer* (Detroit, 1996), 18–19.

¹⁵⁰ University of Southampton Library, MS 157, Jewish Religious Education Board Papers, Minute Book of the Executive Committee, 1878–87, Annual Report, 1878, 6.

¹⁵¹ *JC*, 8 June 1883, 9. Such was Charlotte de Rothschild's renown in this area that upon her death Hermann Adler dedicated a sermon to her: '*Remember the Poor*': *A Sermon Preached in Memory of the Late Baroness Lionel de Rothschild at the Central Synagogue* (London, 1884).

¹⁵² *The Times*, 4 Dec. 1862, 5, and *JC*, 9 Oct. 1863, 5.

¹⁵³ 'The Law of Moses, The Great End of Revelation', Mar. 1858, in D. Marks, *Sermons Preached at Various Occasions at the West London Synagogue of British Jews* (London 1885), 25.

¹⁵⁴ Adler, *Purpose and Methods*, 11. Emphasis in original.

Whilst these trends were reflected in wider society's separation of gender spheres, Judaism, particularly Orthodoxy, its followers realized, could be accused of disregarding women. Artom tackled this subject in 1870: 'So among the Jews woman has no public office, and she will have none, as long as Judaism is not undermined by rash and unreasonable changes. But a graceful office, as I said, is reserved for her . . . the Jewish woman is the priestess of the home.'¹⁵⁵ Significant sections of communal opinion were unwilling to accept such restriction. The *JC* was particularly progressive. Recalling on numerous occasions the difference in women's position in the ancient and modern world—where it felt in many ways they were the equal of men—it pushed for this to be officially recognized within Orthodoxy's 'anti-natural, repressive system'.¹⁵⁶

The part assigned to women by Orthodox Judaism in the religious world cannot satisfy her spiritual cravings. . . . why should Judaism be so callous to this evil, while the daughter religion with such marvellous tact, with such profound knowledge of human nature, turns the vast resources of the female heart to such an excellent account?¹⁵⁷

Judaism's appreciation of female needs lagged behind that of most Christian denominations and much of British society in general. Some in the community were anxious this would lead to alienation, and toward the end of the period there is evidence of gathering discontent among Jewish women. 'A Jewess' exposed the stultifying life of middle-class women in an 1886 letter to the *JC*. Complaining that 'the shadow of the harem has rested on our womankind', she decried an unfulfilling and divided world, where Jewish men

scarcely feel the need of feminine society in its higher forms. Whereas the women, such of them as are beginning to be conscious of the yoke, are more readily adaptable, more eager to absorb the atmosphere around them; and by reason of their extra leisure, have in many cases outstripped their brothers in culture. . . . The inevitable result is that Jewish men and women of any width of culture, are driven to finding their friends of the other sex in the Gentile camp.¹⁵⁸

The possibility of such Gentile–Jewish intermixing frightened Anglo-Jewry. The *JC* considered this 'tender ground' a huge problem for the emancipated community, and the prevention of marrying out had been

¹⁵⁵ 'Women and Passover', Apr. 1870, in B. Artom, *Sermons* (London, 1873), 90.

¹⁵⁶ *JC*, 24 Oct. 1862, 4, and 28 Sept. 1877, 3.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.* 28 Sept. 1877, 3.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.* 17 Sept. 1886, 7.

a prominent motivation behind the paper's drive for greater female religious involvement. 'In how far can the synagogue show indulgence to marriages beyond the pale? This is not a question of tolerance, but of principle—indeed, of "to be or not to be" to Judaism in free countries, in which the law opposes no obstacles to such marriages.'¹⁵⁹ In Britain, where Jews' subcultural cohesion was voluntary, such loss of members to other sects or seepage into wider society represented a potentially fatal phenomenon. The example of the original Sephardic families, who had re-established the community but by the end of the seventeenth century disappeared into near complete absorption, stood as stark warning to a minority now unrestricted in its access to the surrounding world.¹⁶⁰ The *JC* resolutely denounced all instances of this 'evil',¹⁶¹ even taking the Rothschilds to task in 1877, claiming that 'the community has experienced the most poignant grief at the intelligence received' of Hannah de Rothschild's engagement to Lord Rosebery: 'the apprehension of the consequence which this alliance may produce in the community by the example thus set casts a still gloomier shadow over the communal sadness.'¹⁶² But it seems the community were broadly in sympathy with the paper's opposition. When Henry de Worms sanctioned his daughter's Anglican marriage he was requested to resign his fourteen-year presidency of the Anglo-Jewish Association; in 1895, Arthur Cohen, not personally Orthodox, felt obliged to resign the presidency of the Board of Deputies upon his daughter's out-marriage.¹⁶³ Out-marriage was not acceptable to Anglo-Jewry. Despite their lax standards of observance, such levels of fraternization were still anathema.

Evidently, though, it was happening. Abraham Benisch realized that no matter the religious proscription, greater interaction with Gentiles made cases inevitable: 'Whether parents approve of it or not, intimacies of the tenderest nature will spring up between the young of two sexes . . . And what is the consequence?'¹⁶⁴ A hard line in these circumstances could lead to division of families, alienation of the individual involved, and the consequent loss of their future

¹⁵⁹ *JC*, 31 May 1867, 6.

¹⁶⁰ M. Davis, 'Mixed Marriage in Western Jewry: Historical Background to the Jewish Response', *JJS* 10/2 (Dec. 1968), 183.

¹⁶¹ *JC*, 31 May 1867, 6.

¹⁶² *Ibid.* 5 Oct. 1877, 8.

¹⁶³ Endelman, 'Communal Solidarity', 509, and I. Finstein, 'Radical Assimilation in Anglo-Jewry', Review Article, *JJS* 34/2 (Dec. 1992), 134.

¹⁶⁴ Benisch, *Judaism Surveyed*, 29.

children to the faith. Aware of this, and their inability to effectively prohibit such marriages, a subtle softening of opinion occurred within the community over the post-emancipation decades. Demonstrating the versatile nature of their identity, Anglo-Jewry developed a casuistic differentiation between types of out-marriage. The *JC* explained this discernment in 1878:

To begin with, marriage with Gentiles in the abstract is nowhere forbidden in the law . . . What was forbidden was not intermarriages, but mixed marriages. But when the Gentile partner embraced the religion of Sinai, as did Zipporah, the wife of Moses, as did Ruth, the wife of Boaz, the marriage did not with it carry the least taint. When Nehemiah insisted upon the separation of the Jewish husbands from their Gentile wives, it was because these unions were mixed marriages. And, indeed, anything more unhappy in society, anything more demoralising cannot be imagined than mixed marriages.¹⁶⁵

Reform, with its greater emphasis upon written over oral law, was even more accommodating. Its second minister, Albert Löwy, opined that the rabbinical period had banned it, the *Shulchan Aruch* not holding mixed marriages valid, and that ‘there is no biblical authority for excluding from the Jewish community any person contracting a mixed marriage’.¹⁶⁶

With these allowances marriages between Jews and Gentiles occurred throughout the period. In 1863, for instance, Abraham Fonseca was able to continue worshipping with the West London Synagogue, having civilly married a Christian but obtained her written assent to raising any children as Jews: ‘It is my particular wish and desire that my children be brought up and educated as members of the Jewish community the same as my husband. I must take the liberty of informing you that I am a Protestant and do not intend in any way to change that.’¹⁶⁷ Bevis Marks had in a few exceptional circumstances accepted intermarriages since the eighteenth century, but its registers reveal a more continuous occurrence in this period; albeit at the still minor rate of six to seven a decade between 1861 and 1880.¹⁶⁸ Despite concern, the issue never manifested

¹⁶⁵ *JC*, 10 May 1878, 4.

¹⁶⁶ University of Southampton Library, MS 140/10/6, West London Synagogue of British Jews Records, Letter from Löwy to H. Henriques, 6 Jan. 1885. The *Shulchan Aruch* was the standard code of Ashkenazi law and practice, first codified and published by Joseph Caro in the sixteenth century.

¹⁶⁷ University of Southampton Library, MS 140/131/11, West London Synagogue of British Jews Records, Declaration of Abraham Fonseca, 22 June 1863 with supporting letter from his wife Alice, 13 May 1863.

¹⁶⁸ A. Hyamson, *The Sephardim of England: A History of the Spanish and Portuguese Jewish Community, 1492–1951* (London, 1951), 176–7, and G. Whitehill (ed.), *Bevis*

itself as a substantial social phenomenon at this time. Even among the Cousinhood, confronted most sharply with societal temptations to marry for reasons of wealth and status, out-marriage was minimal.¹⁶⁹ That it was sanctioned at all is telling of Anglo-Jewry's accommodating religiosity. Though the community was careful to religiously justify this licence, its willingness to condone certain conditions of intermarriage seems to have been motivated not by conviction but the preserving necessity of endogamy to a minority.

The occurrence of intermarriage raised, in turn, another sensitive subject regarding Anglo-Jewry's group cohesion and relationship with other denominations: Jewish proselytizing. The two issues were intricately linked. The rationale underpinning Orthodox toleration of intermarriage was that the non-Jewish partner would convert and the family therefore remain within the fold. 'The admission of a proselyte under such circumstances is no doubt an evil. But it is an evil not of our seeking, and of the two evils it is undoubtedly the minor.'¹⁷⁰ Problematically, the community had refrained from accepting proselytes since the Resettlement, assuming this to be a reciprocal condition stipulated by Cromwell and Charles II in exchange for toleration. Potential proselytes were forced to sojourn abroad: 'Every year . . . a considerable number of Christian women have gone over to Holland, Belgium, and France, and have there renounced Christianity in favour of the more ancient faith, the rabbis in these countries being under no obligation to refuse proselytes.'¹⁷¹ Soon after emancipation the *JC* opened its columns to consideration of this situation.¹⁷² Equal citizens, Jews now began to consider the propriety of this self-imposed restriction. As always, the traditionalist wing rejected any change. 'Israel desires no increase from without,' was their stance.¹⁷³ But general opinion tended to be favourable. 'It certainly seems to me that we are bound to open our arms to those who, from conviction, desire to become Jews,' commented a *JC* correspondent, demonstrating that support for proselytizing went beyond practical motivations connected to intermarriage.¹⁷⁴ The

Marks Records, Part III (London, 1973), 6. There was, though, a notable increase to twenty-three in the next decade, 1881–90.

¹⁶⁹ L. Levi D'Ancona, 'Paths of Jewish Integration: Upper-Middle-Class Families in Nineteenth-Century France, Italy and England' (Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge, 2004), 85.

¹⁷⁰ *JC*, 26 May 1876, 115.

¹⁷² *JC*, 17 Sept. 1858, 318.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.* 18 Mar. 1859, 4.

¹⁷¹ *The Times*, 2 Mar. 1877, 11.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.* 22 Oct. 1858, 6.

paper concurred; calling for the reinstatement of Proselytes of the Gate, it optimistically claimed some converting mechanism would not only benefit Judaism but also be a mercy to dissatisfied Gentiles:

It would . . . be cruel to refuse the intending proselytes the spiritual satisfaction which they would derive from religious communion with those with whom they are mentally at one, as soon as it should be ascertained beyond all doubt that the creed which they are anxious to renounce can no longer afford them that internal peace and happiness after which every devout soul yearns.¹⁷⁵

In this atmosphere the ecclesiastical authorities lifted restrictions upon proselytism in 1877.¹⁷⁶

During the rest of the period there was a steady, if very small, flow of non-Jews into the community. The records of the West London Synagogue show that whilst the majority of these resulted from intermarriage, there were occasional converts of conviction. The widow Helen Lewis was admitted in 1887 after she 'made declaration that in taking this step she was in no way influenced by any mundane consideration, but by an intense conviction of conscience'.¹⁷⁷ All proselytes underwent a course of Jewish instruction, upon which they were examined; men were also circumcised, while Orthodox women underwent ritual bathing. These requirements were not usually applied in a dissuasive manner. Professor Marks and Isidore Harris,

¹⁷⁵ Ibid. 28 Jan. 1876, 705. Proselytes of the Gate are converts to Judaism who accept the monotheistic faith out of conviction but are not required to fulfil all the ritual observances incumbent upon Orthodox Jews. Proselytes of Righteousness are converts who accept both the doctrine and entire set of Jewish observances. It is possible to proceed from being the former to the latter.

¹⁷⁶ *The Times*, 2 Mar. 1877, 11. This decision was no doubt influenced by the situation in some British colonies, over which the Chief Rabbinate claimed jurisdiction, where the number of Jewish men greatly outnumbered that of Jewish women, and intermarriage was far more commonly practised. Australian Jewry seems to have particularly experienced problems regulating rates of intermarriage during this time. See, for example, LMA, ACC/2805/02/01/010, Office of the Chief Rabbi, Correspondence: Australia, 1879–81 and LMA, ACC/2805/02/01/04, Correspondence: Melbourne *Beth Din*.

¹⁷⁷ University of Southampton Library, MS 309 A1069/1, Papers relating to converts to Judaism. Certificate of Helen Lewis signed by D. Marks, A. Löwy, and I. Harris, 8 Nov. 1887. The records of Reform concerning conversions have survived in much greater quantity than have Orthodoxy's. Unfortunately, the section of the *Beth Din* archives dealing with proselytism was destroyed in the Second World War and so it is impossible to judge or compare the extent of conversions to Orthodoxy. The small amount of extant evidence does, at least, reveal that some conversions took place in this period, though; see MS 309 A1069/4.

having obtained satisfactory answers, accepted a convert in 1886 but noted:

Our colleague Mr Löwy stated that he would offer no obstacle to Mr Lowinsky's admission, but that he would not sign in favour of any convert who was not sufficiently instructed in Hebrew to follow the synagogue ritual. We do not make the same objection, because if it were consistently held, more than half the congregation would be inadmissible as members, as they have even less Hebrew than Mr Lowinsky.¹⁷⁸

The relaxed standard of communal religiosity also applied to this sphere.

It was not, though, a communal issue. The number of proselytes remained minute and the existence of these downplayed, for the minority remained extremely sensitive of the topic. Historically, Christian Europe had been murderously hostile to Jewish proselytism, and Anglo-Jews, long unsure about its legality in Britain, were wary of provoking resentment. However, in a time of increasing racial thinking, reticence in this area could also be criticized. Professor Goldwin Smith, for instance, thought it a mark of Jewish tribalism: 'If Judaism is universal, why, I ask again, is it not proselytising?'¹⁷⁹ When it came to proselytizing, Anglo-Jewry could be upbraided whichever direction it took. A middle position was therefore adopted, once again. Proselytes, Claude Montefiore observed, 'are neither sought nor rejected'.¹⁸⁰ This compromise perfectly suited the minority's needs, allowing it to accept necessary converts without having to risk reproach or dilution, whilst also avoiding the accusation of an exclusive ethnicity.

Anglo-Jewry's approach to intermarriage and proselytism reveals a tight-knit community—with minor exceptions, a remarkably cohesive group. This level of minority solidarity was retained, Todd Endelman shows, at a time when the offspring of prosperous nonconformist families defected to the Established Church in large numbers.¹⁸¹ The wry observation that 'the carriage only stops for one generation at the chapel door' could not be levelled at Victorian Jewry.¹⁸² This situation existed even though Jews were under special pressure to abandon their faith. Conversion to Christianity had never been the 'ticket of admission'

¹⁷⁸ University of Southampton Library, MS 309 A1069/1, Certificate of Mr Lowinsky, 21 July 1886, signed by Marks and Harris.

¹⁷⁹ G. Smith, 'Can Jews be Patriots?', *Nineteenth Century* (May 1878), 878.

¹⁸⁰ C. Montefiore, 'Is Judaism a Tribal Religion?', *Contemporary Review* (Sept. 1882), 369.

¹⁸¹ Endelman, 'Communal Solidarity', 491.

¹⁸² Obelkevich, 'Religion', 333.

to British society, but there had always been a significant strand within British Protestant thought interested in Jewish conversion. In the post-emancipation era there were several small but far from insignificant organizations devoted to missionizing the community.¹⁸³ The oldest and most influential of these was the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews; presided over for much of this time by the Earl of Shaftesbury, with the Archbishop of Canterbury as patron, and the King of Prussia a long-term donor.¹⁸⁴ Founded in 1809, the Society boasted by the end of the period an annual income of around £37,000 and possessed twenty-seven agents working out of six mission stations in Britain.¹⁸⁵ To convert the Jews of London it operated a chapel, free school, and house of industry in the East End, where its followers also distributed religious tracts and Hebrew New Testaments.¹⁸⁶

The community was hostile to these activities, which, after emancipation, seemed to question their legitimacy as citizens.¹⁸⁷ The *JC*, claiming 'there exists an actual state of warfare' between Jews and conversionists, scathingly denounced 'a society pursuing a most iniquitous object, a bubble scheme, an arrant folly, an absurdity as great as that of endeavouring to empty the ocean', and exposed the hypocrisy of tactics that preyed upon poverty and infancy:

we tell them plainly that they neither follow the example of their master whom they pretend to follow or of his apostles. When Jesus . . . sent his disciples forth to preach he did not enjoin on them to enforce a hearing among those that were unwilling to listen to them, but advised them to shake off the dust, and to travel on to some better disposed place.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸³ The *Jewish Chronicle* listed these four agencies as conversionist: London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews; British Society for the Propagation of the Gospel among the Jews; the Scotch Society; and Parochial Missions to the Jews: see 28 May 1886, 7. M. Ragusis, *Figures of Conversion: 'The Jewish Question' and English National Identity* (London, 1995), 299, lists also the East London Mission to the Jews and the Barbican Mission to the Jews. In regard to those societies mentioned by the *JC*, the great majority of their efforts were undertaken abroad, particularly in Germany, Poland, and Palestine.

¹⁸⁴ *The Times*, 3 May 1844, 6, and 7 May 1858, 9. The Society also conducted significant operations in Liverpool and Manchester.

¹⁸⁵ Bodleian Library, Church's Ministry among the Jews Papers, Dep. C.M.J. d.22, Miscellaneous Papers concerning the society in mission work at home and abroad, 1868–1940.

¹⁸⁶ R. Smith, 'The London Jews' Society and Patterns of Jewish Conversion in England, 1801–1859', *JSS* 43 (1981), 276.

¹⁸⁷ T. Endelman, 'Introduction', in idem (ed.), *Jewish Apostasy in the Modern World* (New York, 1987), 1.

¹⁸⁸ *JC*, 12 Feb. 1858, 68; 29 Jan. 1864, 4; 5 Feb. 1864, 4.

These sentiments that were echoed by the general press from time to time, as British society displayed a distaste for aggressive missionizing. This was most clearly demonstrated across 1867–70 in reactions to the Lyons Case, or the ‘Jewess Abduction Case’, as some contemporaries termed it; the anti-conversion *cause célèbre* of the post-emancipation era.¹⁸⁹ With all the elements of a gripping Victorian drama—troublesome youth, religious clashes, subterfuge, and even fainting female witnesses—the story of Esther Lyons, an 18-year-old Jewish girl converted after she sought refuge with a local Wesleyan minister following a quarrel with her father, divided her home city of Cardiff, upset the Jewish community, and attracted sensational headlines nationwide, most condemnatory of the conversionists’ actions, which were indeed suspect. Quickly persuading Esther of the evils of Judaism, the minister and his wife converted her and spirited her away to London, refusing on several occasions to allow family members access, frequently lying about her whereabouts, and even forging correspondence. Though her father brought several legal cases, he was unable to regain his daughter because she was no longer a minor and judged responsible for her own actions. The mendacity of the conversionists was, however, clearly exposed by the courts. ‘Jewish conversion is indeed dear if it is purchased at this cost of the commonest Christian charity and decency,’ commented *The Times* on the 1869 trial.¹⁹⁰

With societal disapprobation reinforcing their antagonism, Anglo-Jewry often pursued a pro-active defence against the missionaries. Members of the elite wrote to preachers to make them ‘aware that the Jews of the educated classes resented the interference of the missionaries among their poor’; the Board of Guardians established rival facilities to combat conversionist free services; and sermons were infiltrated and interrupted.¹⁹¹ Augmenting this was a near total estrangement of

¹⁸⁹ U. Henriques, ‘Lyons vs. Thomas: The Jewess Abduction Case’, in *Jewish Historical Studies*, 29 (1982–6) provides a full assessment of the Lyons Case and public reactions to it.

¹⁹⁰ *The Times*, 2 Aug. 1869, 9.

¹⁹¹ LMA, ACC/2805/02/01/098, Office of the Chief Rabbi Papers, Letter from F. D. Mocatta to Adler, 15 Mar. 1886; University of Southampton Library, MS 173 1/12/1, Archives of Jewish Care, Jewish Board of Guardians: Scheme for and Reports of, 1859–65, Annual Report 1865, 60, and *JC*, 19 Apr. 1861, 6. During the Esther Lyons Case, several *JC* correspondents argued that a robust Jewish education was essential in fending off missionary efforts: ‘no Jewish girl can become a Christian unless her religious education has been grossly neglected.’ Interestingly, this attitude, and the community’s general antipathy to conversionists, does not seem to have influenced the low level of

converted Jews by the community, a factor admitted as a great obstacle by conversionists:

When a Jew becomes a Christian, he falls at once into a deplorable condition. He is cursed and thrown off by his family and friends. He is excluded from his trade. He becomes a pariah and an outcast among his people. There is reason to believe that there is a considerable number who accept but who dare not profess Christianity from fear of the Jews.¹⁹²

In such conditions conversion activities in Britain had a minuscule impact upon the Jewish minority. Over 1871–2, after an expenditure of £1,941 6s. 5d., the Society achieved only twenty-five conversions.¹⁹³ The quality of these converts was felt to match their paltry quantity; or as the *JC* put it: ‘Conversion, as the societies practise it, means but the turning of a bad Jew into a worse Christian.’¹⁹⁴ The Society’s records list 513 Jews baptized between November 1863 and January 1881. The vast majority of adults among these were foreign with occupations implying a low-class status; whilst the infants listed were generally English, virtually all were resident in traditionally immigrant areas of east London, suggesting they were second generation—when mentioned, their parents’ occupations were predominantly working class.¹⁹⁵ The settled, native community was untouched: ‘the conversionist tactics did us, upon the whole, no harm. Stragglers no doubt may be cut off, but on the fortress itself no impression was made.’¹⁹⁶ This abject failure of well-endowed conversion efforts became a source of pride for Anglo-Jewry, a witness to the continuing strength of its Jewish affiliation: ‘A more splendid testimony to Israel’s character, and the faithfulness of its members to the God of their fathers, could not have been borne than that given by this result.’¹⁹⁷

religious schooling provided by the community, as described earlier in this chapter. See *JC*, 20 Aug. 1869, 4.

¹⁹² *The Conversion of the Jews* (Apr. 1888), 200. Endelman places considerable stress upon the dissuasive potential of this treatment for possible converts, judging the economic problems of being so outcast in a community where one’s closest acquaintances were probably all Jews a ‘distinct liability’. T. Endelman, ‘The Social and Political Context of Conversion in Germany and England, 1870–1914’, in idem (ed.), *Jewish Apostasy*, 97.

¹⁹³ Bodleian Library, Church’s Ministry among the Jews Papers, Dep. C.M.J.d.22, Miscellaneous Papers concerning the society in mission work at home and abroad, 1868–1940.

¹⁹⁴ *JC*, 9 May 1879, 9.

¹⁹⁵ Bodleian Library, Church’s Ministry among the Jews Papers, Dep. C.M.J.c.64, Volume containing personal records of Hebrew converts baptized at the Episcopal Jews’ Chapel in Palestine Place, 1863–81.

¹⁹⁶ *JC*, 12 Feb. 1858, 68.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.* 24 May 1861, 4.

For all its disdain of conversionists and their methods, there existed a significant existential commonality between Anglo-Jewry and the societies: eschatological belief in the Restoration of Israel. Although the London Society was never officially committed to this idea, in practice it became a major rallying ground for adherents of the concept.¹⁹⁸ At its sixtieth anniversary meeting the Society resolved: 'That the infallible promises of God to Israel of the recovery and salvation . . . and the interest still so remarkably manifested in present times towards the Holy City and its land by the Gentiles . . . should greatly encourage us in seeking the salvation of the remnant and in beseeching the Lord to hasten the time when all Israel shall be saved.'¹⁹⁹ The millennial expectations Christians invested in Jewish Return were not limited to conversion societies but pervaded British Protestant, and particularly evangelical, tradition.²⁰⁰ The 'Gentile interest' mentioned included that of the British government, which had taken hundreds of former Russian Jews in the Holy Land under its protection since instructing its newly established agent in January 1839 'that it would be part of his duty, as British Vice-Consul in Jerusalem, to afford protection to the Jews generally'.²⁰¹

Anglo-Jewry was not insensitive to this interest. The *JC* thought that most Protestants 'agree in expecting a new state of development in the world's history from the predicted restoration of the Jewish people to their former land. . . . we profoundly sympathise with the Protestant opinion, which perceives a mysterious bond between Judaism and mankind's moral and religious development.'²⁰² But the community was

¹⁹⁸ J. Frankel, *The Damascus Affair: 'Ritual Murder', Politics, and the Jews in 1840* (Cambridge, 1997), 288.

¹⁹⁹ Bodleian Library, Church's Ministry among the Jews Papers, Dep. C.M.J.c.61, Minutes of Annual Meetings, 1834–88.

²⁰⁰ Frankel, *Damascus Affair*, 285.

²⁰¹ National Archives, FO 881/4907, Confidential Memorandum Relative to the Grant of British Protection to Foreign Jews in Palestine, 2 Feb. 1884, 1. The 'adoption' of these former Russian Jews was facilitated by an 1847 directive to the British Consul instructing 'that whenever an Austrian, Russian, French, or other Jew, should be suffering under persecution or injustice, and should be repudiated, and refused protection by his own Consul, the British Consul in the district, upon ascertaining the fact, might without impropriety ask the repudiating Consul whether he have any objection to the British Consul interposing his good offices on behalf of the Jew'. The British government was attempting to phase out its protection of these Jews, which, having been extended beyond the original generation, was becoming a local problem by the post-emancipation decades. For details of British Consulate activity in Palestine see A. Hyamson (ed.), *The British Consulate in Jerusalem in Relation to the Jews of Palestine*, 2 vols. (London, 1939).

²⁰² *JC*, 17 Feb. 1860, 4.

more restrained in its discussion of any possible Return than were many Protestant enthusiasts. Appreciating the possible philosemitic results of such sympathy, Jews were also aware that besides stoking conversionist zeal, the question of Israel's Restoration possessed negative ramifications for the combined nature of their identity. It had been one reason advanced by parliamentary opponents for denying emancipation and was increasingly appropriated for modern anti-Semitic ends.²⁰³ If their identity as Orthodox Jews was to remain in any way valid, however, the community could not abjure its connection with the Holy Land and the Jewish communities present there.

In the post-emancipation decades it did not do so. Chapter 3 has noted the financial appeals Anglo-Jewry issued for Palestine Jews. These were supported by important sections of the community. Moses Montefiore was famous for his devotion to Palestinian Jewry, and his journeys of amelioration to the Holy Land were widely and favourably reported in the British press.²⁰⁴ However, the majority of the community was less enamoured, it seems. Donations to appeals quickly petered out. In August 1874, that year's Holy Land Relief Fund had collected just £37 14s. 7d. from the Great Synagogue, compared to the £150 10s. 4d. donated by its congregants on 'Hospital Sunday'.²⁰⁵ Even Montefiore's Testimonial Fund, which he wished devoted to practically aid Palestinian Jews, could not overcome Anglo-Jewry's negative opinions; as the *JW* admitted:

It is useless to disguise the fact that the Montefiore Testimonial is not achieving the speedy success which we anticipated would fall its share; the community generally have failed to support it, not from any disregard for the claims which Sir Moses Montefiore has upon their admiration and gratitude, but from a mistaken notion of the character of the people for whose advantages the funds will be disbursed.²⁰⁶

Modern and Anglicized, British Jews held their Palestinian brethren in poor regard, and whilst there was sympathy, there was little empathy. Even the *JC* partook of this sentiment occasionally: 'The repeated journeys of the venerable philanthropist, Sir Moses Montefiore, to Jerusalem, proved of little permanent benefit to the Hebrew population . . . Misery, sloth, superstition and ignorance have long held

²⁰³ Smith, 'Can Jews be Patriots?', 885.

²⁰⁴ *The Times*, 13 Aug. 1875; *Daily Telegraph*, 20 Sept. 1875, 3.

²⁰⁵ LMA, ACC/2712/GTS/007, USP, Great Synagogue: Minute Books, 1870–1937.

²⁰⁶ *JW*, 23 July 1875, 4.

sway over the Israelites of Palestine . . . sympathy for them has greatly abated in Western Europe.’²⁰⁷

Anglo-Jewish attitudes towards the Holy Land communities were ambivalent—as was their approach to Restoration more generally. Literal belief in or desire for the Return had long been discarded. ‘Why pray for the termination of a captivity in which we are free?’ pondered N. S. Joseph.²⁰⁸ The concept was never removed from the liturgy, however, and prayers for the Return still occupied a prominent place in Anglo-Jewish worship, both Orthodox and Reform. Its consonance with popular Protestant ideals meant that, in Britain, Jews were never pushed to formally renounce their messianic hopes: ‘because we love England much, we need not love Zion less.’²⁰⁹ Restoration still held dangerous implications for Jewish patriotism—the anti-Semiticly minded viewed it as evidence of a dual loyalty—but the community circumvented these by abstracting Restoration to a providentially ordained future point, which could not be hastened by human endeavour. ‘The day of redemption lies outside the range of human vision,’ preached Simeon Singer.²¹⁰ The Zionism that existed in the community was religious not political. It was also, as with many particular Jewish concepts, filtered through and blended with English nationalism. The standard conclusion for Anglo-Jewish prayers on special or national occasions, for example, often combined English and Jewish forms and patriotisms: ‘May the supreme King of kings, through his infinite mercy, incline her [Queen Victoria’s] heart and the hearts of her councillors and nobles, with benevolence toward us, and all Israel. In her days and ours may Judah be saved, and Israel dwell in safety; and may the Redeemer come unto Zion.’²¹¹ The Return was hereby connected with Victorian Britain, and the temporal glory of that country linked with the spiritual glory of all mankind.

²⁰⁷ *JC*, 13 Sept. 1878, 4.

²⁰⁸ University of Southampton Library, MS 116/57, Small Jewish Collections, Manuscript of N. S. Joseph: ‘Religion, Natural and Revealed: A Series of Progressive Lectures for Jewish Youth’ (1879), 226.

²⁰⁹ *JC*, 20 Aug. 1869, 6.

²¹⁰ S. Singer, ‘The Messianic Idea in Judaism’ (1887), in *The Literary Remains of the Rev. Simeon Singer: Lectures and Addresses*, selected and ed. Israel Abrahams (London, 1908), 201.

²¹¹ LMA, ACC/2805/01/05/01, Office of the Chief Rabbi Papers, General: Orders of Service, Apr. 1858, Form of Prayer and Thanksgiving to be used in all synagogues of the united congregations for the success granted to our arms in suppressing the rebellion and restoring tranquillity in Her Majesty’s Indian Dominions.

The Return did not feature greatly in post-emancipation, Anglo-Jewish religious discourse. Having smoothed the possible antagonisms between present citizenship and future promise, the community kept the idea in the background. Its religious hopes were based upon another strand of Jewish messianism: the Jewish Mission, which, with some environmental reconceptualization, came to epitomize the possibilities and ideals of their combined identity. Anglo-Jewry began to articulate this idea after emancipation.²¹² Suffused with the intellectual atmosphere of the mid Victorian age—Jewish conformity was not limited to socio-political or religious concepts—the Anglo-Jewish mission was based upon a panacean belief in progress. Emancipated Jews had always looked to educational and technological advances for the destruction of the ignorance they thought generated prejudice. But their modernized mission applied the (roughly) linear progress of civilization, currently exemplified by Britain, to religious destiny, where Judaism was the acme. ‘It is with the progress of religion as with that in the physical sciences’, explained the *JC*: various stages can be determined between the base and the pinnacle. ‘[T]he distance from the gross fetishism of the negro to the pure monotheism of the Jew, [via] the byways of the worship of the elements in Sabbeism, deified man in Roman and Greek idolatry, and restricted polytheism in Christianity.’²¹³ Judaism was posited as the agent and outcome of this progress. ‘Let any man turn to our Pentateuch and enquire from it . . . He will learn that there is no limit to human progress,’ preached O. J. Simon.²¹⁴ Contradicting the critical Christian image of Judaism as a legalistic creed, this understanding placed the faith in the van of progress, a civilizing force compatible with modern sophistication.²¹⁵

²¹² The Anglo-Jewish Mission never developed into an ideology or systematized theory. It represented more a series of beliefs that contemporary religious leaders, in particular Hermann Adler, gradually connected to form a highbrow component of Anglo-Jewish theology.

²¹³ *JC*, 3 June 1864, 4. This idea differed substantially from the progressive conception of Judaism German Reform Jews held. Anglo-Jewry viewed progression as linear between religions; the Germans believed progression also took place within faiths, thinking that Judaism had evolved from biblical, Talmudic, to contemporary, and would evolve further. This idea received no support in England: see M. Meyer, ‘Jewish Religious Reform in Germany and Britain’, in M. Brenner, R. Liedtke, and D. Rechter (eds.), *Two Nations: British and German Jews in Comparative Perspective* (Tübingen, 1999), 71.

²¹⁴ *JC*, 22 Sept. 1882, 4.

²¹⁵ I. Finestein, ‘Hermann Adler (1839–1911): Portrait of Jewish Victorian Extraordinary’, in idem, *Anglo-Jewry in Changing Times*, 224.

This force was to act not only internally, among the Jews, but also externally, among the Gentiles. Anglo-Jewish religious leaders, frequently quoting Isaiah's prophecies, portrayed Israel as 'the instructor of all nations'.²¹⁶ By precept and example they were to teach pure monotheism and the moral law; as Artom expounded: 'Israel has no political task. His mission is entirely moral. He may be called, so to say, the *ideal-people*, the people that must always offer the spectacle of morality and virtue.'²¹⁷ Jewry was to be a didactic model; a reserve 'kept back by Providence' as 'a light to the Gentiles'.²¹⁸ This conception imbued Jewish particularity with positivity; in fact, made its continued religious distinction imperative. British Christians could also appreciate this interpretation of the Jewish mission. Writing in 1878, Revd Fremantle admitted that whilst 'less readily accepted' than Restorationism, he thought:

It can hardly be denied that, as a matter of fact, they have been witnesses of the truth, and that the presence of the Jewish factor in religious history has been a constant protest against superstition and the multiplication of dogmas. . . . The spectacle of a community with a high morality, and a faith of rugged and extreme simplicity, may justly be considered as a Providential antidote to the excess of *Aberglaube*.²¹⁹

Not all Christians, however, accepted this interpretation. Some assessed the mission negatively, especially towards the end of the period when anti-Semitic rhetoric began to infiltrate debates on the Jews' future. The conversionist pamphlet penned by S. Kellogg fretted over 'the confident expectation and determination of these enfranchised Jews, that not Christianity, but Judaism . . . shall yet win the world against Christianity'.²²⁰ No doubt in part to counter such fears of an insular Jewish salvation and in reaction to the sinister undertones of ethnic solidarity that often accompanied them, the Anglo-Jewish mission was invested with a third commitment. Its benefits were to be universal. Professor Marks explained this early on in a pre-emancipation sermon: That is our essential vocation as Israelites, to be constantly employed in the promotion of our own improvement and of the comfort and well-being of our

²¹⁶ *JC*, 20 Aug. 1858, 285.

²¹⁷ 'The Heifer and the Calf', Mar. 1871, in Artom, *Sermons*, 272. Emphasis in original.

²¹⁸ *JC*, 25 Sept. 1863, 4, and Isaiah 42: 6.

²¹⁹ W. Fremantle, 'The Future of Judaism', *Contemporary Review* (July 1878), 784.

²²⁰ S. Kellogg, *The Jews or Prediction and Fulfilment an Argument for the Times*, 2nd edn. (London, 1887), 210.

fellow creatures. Between mankind of every nation and of every faith a universal bond of brotherhood should be recognised, for the inspired prophet hath said 'We have all one and the same Father: One God is the creator of us all.'²²¹

Hermann Adler, defending Anglo-Jewry from accusations of tribalism in 1878, talked up Israel's messianic catholicity, which predicted for the future: 'Not Israel, the triumphant, enthroned in majesty at Zion as the conqueror of the earth, but all the nations of the globe beatified by the possession of truth and the acknowledgement of the divine unity.'²²²

Throughout the era, Anglo-Jewish religious leaders were at pains to emphasize that their mission and the messianic era it would culminate in were designed for mankind entire. 'The belief in the advance of the human race and the doctrine of the Messiah are but expressions of the same great truth.'²²³ With this rationale Anglo-Jews became, as R. Huttenback suggests, a 'doubly distilled elite': 'While Jews through their chosen status were in a spiritual sense charged with the final redemption of mankind, the British bore a similar responsibility in the temporal sphere.'²²⁴ As British Jews the community was, therefore, twice privileged. Symbiotically participating in Britain's civilizing mission, whilst also advancing their religious mission, Anglo-Jewry found both components of its identity synchronized. Jewish particularity was reconciled with English universalism and the community's dual identity could now be understood beneficially. The reformulated Jewish mission overcame, if only theoretically, the dichotomy of emancipation.

V

In the post-emancipation era Anglo-Jewry completed development of a unique version of Jewish faith: the *Minhag Anglia*, an Anglo-Judaism. It was a religion that mirrored the community's identity, both reflecting and moulding their minority subculture. As with the community's approach to politics, compromise was its essence: the space required to successfully balance multi-layered identities in a modern society, its

²²¹ 'Never Miss an Opportunity for doing Good', Nov. 1854, in Marks, *Sermons*, 153. Passage quoted is Malachi 2: 10.

²²² H. Adler, 'Can Jews be Patriots?', *Nineteenth Century* (Apr. 1878), 639.

²²³ Singer, 'Messianic Idea', 173.

²²⁴ R. Huttenback, 'The Patrician Jew and the British Ethos in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries', *JSS* 40/1 (1978), 51–2.

defining feature. Nathan Adler had talked at his 1845 inauguration of his 'very arduous' task 'in a time when some rest their hopes on rapid innovation, and others on steadfast adherence to whatever time has sanctified . . . to find the golden mean'.²²⁵ Anglo-Judaism was to become this middle ground. Under its inclusive rubric, Jews from across the devotional spectrum satisfied their differing spiritual needs. This situation resulted from emancipation; the need to resolve religious duties and beliefs with full participation in modern society. The *JC* astutely assessed the problem of being religious Jews after emancipation:

In the minds of these people a terrible conflict must arise in Judaism. The question with them will be, how to reconcile these injunctions represented to them as part and parcel of Judaism, with the duties of which their social position, their vocation, and their career imposed upon them. Men placed in this painful position, must become, as it were, judges in their own cause, and of their own accord fix the line which they are bound to come up to and may not pass. They have to propose a compromise to themselves.²²⁶

Anglo-Judaism developed to relieve, as far as possible, the pain and indecision of Jews unsure of their identity in the modern world. A highly centralized ecclesiastical structure was constructed to superintend this process and ensure a framework within which the vast majority of Jews could remain Orthodox. Suppressing fission, the authorities sought to guide Anglo-Jewish religiosity by gradually modernizing and Anglicizing Judaism, often in reaction to communal opinion.

Uptake of official alterations was voluntary. Some congregations were eager, others reticent. Whilst an overall acculturation was obvious, its intensity fluctuated widely from synagogue to synagogue, and even individual worshipper to individual worshipper. Heterogeneity, in both practice and belief, was endemic. 'Really one ceases to know at what time one ought to attend to synagogue; or what one will hear when one gets there; what part of a service, or whether any service at all.'²²⁷ All were considered Orthodox by Anglo-Judaism, however, which accepted differentiation so long as the fundamentals of Jewish law were not transgressed: 'our rule must not be uniformity in ritual, but common belief in the immutable truths which all Jews hold and reverence,' summarized Professor Marks in 1870.²²⁸ These sentiments typified the spirit of

²²⁵ N. Adler, *Sermon Delivered at the Great Synagogue on the Occasion of his Installation into Office as Chief Rabbi of Great Britain* (London, 1845), 11.

²²⁶ *JC*, 5 Feb. 1869, 4.

²²⁷ *Ibid.* 7 Feb. 1868, 4.

²²⁸ *Ibid.* 23 Sept. 1870, 14.

Anglo-Judaism to the extent that, by 1887, there was little to separate, in terms of practice and ideals, Reform Judaism from the Orthodox establishment. Indeed, it was partly as a result of this compromise, which circumvented painful choices between aspects of their identity that often resulted in radical change in European communities, that Reform remained comparatively limited in England.²²⁹

Anglo-Judaism was a product of its environment. Its solution to emancipation was founded upon significant acculturation to British religious patterns, which allowed internal plurality and prioritized formal engagement over exacting adherence. Anglo-Jewry had never devised explanatory systems to justify their adaptation to modern British life, and this lack of relativizing theory naturally extended to the religious realm. Not always consciously or deliberately, though sometimes so, Anglo-Judaism assimilated ideals prevalent among its Christian neighbours. This absorption was ad hoc. Such relaxed modernization suited, and no doubt informed, Jews' individualistic approach to their faith—not all had to adopt the same pace of change. It did not, however, encourage theological interest or passionate piety. Taking its cue from the respectable Gentile society it emulated, the religion, certainly of the Anglo-Jewish elite, increasingly became one of form and association, rather than devotion. Jewish traditions that the community now found irrelevant to, or which were deemed incompatible with, modern life fell into desuetude. Increasingly, even fundamental strictures were dismissed, as Anglo-Jews became detached from a view of Judaism as the mainspring of life. This had been the community's choice. Anglo-Jews' religious needs had changed; they now needed a faith compatible with both sections of their identity. This was more apparent from their approach to religious education. If, as Eugene Black contends, 'schools were the frontlines in the campaign to shape the Jewish subculture', Anglo-Jewry's minority existence was distinguished by religious values subordinated to Anglicized aspirations of socio-economic class.²³⁰ Surveying religious instruction in 1866, Artom lamented, 'Alas, the golden age of Judaism is but a dream.'²³¹

²²⁹ Anglo-Judaism probably contributed also to another favourable comparison: that 'English Jews seemed to have been less prone to neurotic self-loathing than their Continental cousins'. See T. Endelman, 'The Frankaus of London: A Study in Radical Assimilation, 1837–1967', *Jewish History*, 8/1–2 (1994), 131.

²³⁰ E. Black, *The Social Politics of Anglo-Jewry, 1880–1920* (Oxford, 1988), 104.

²³¹ University of Southampton Library, MS 116/94, Small Jewish Collections, Artom, 'Jewish Pastor', 12.

The detachment many Jews evinced toward crucial tenets of their religion, the decline of Hebrew, the failure to create a native clergy, and the lack of Jewish studies would support suggestions that Anglo-Jews were verging towards irreligiosity. But this is to misunderstand the nature of Anglo-Judaism and Jews' adherence to it. As mentioned, it was a faith demonstrated more through formalities than devotion. Those Jews who only occasionally or no longer observed all traditional rites still remained, for the large part, religiously associated with the community through congregational membership, synagogue attendance—even if only on festivals—and involvement in communal organizations. Post-emancipation, subcultural existence had to be confined to confession, and Anglo-Jews appreciated this—they still wanted to remain Jews. For all its laxity, there was very little leakage from the community via conversion or out-marriage. More importantly, these factors demonstrate the continuing cohesion of the subculture in free society. Whilst this bond was attacked by hostile Gentiles, by the end of the period Anglo-Jewry had formulated a religious conception that justified retention of their Jewishness. This Anglo-Jewish mission was the extreme example of the complementary combination of identities that, if only ideally, comprised Anglo-Judaism.

Anglo-Judaism was a singular faith in nineteenth-century Britain. No other denomination could compare with its minority, non-Christian, and tightly grouped identity. It was unique. Yet it was not isolated. In the post-emancipation period, as over the Victorian era more broadly, the faith participated in many of the major religious developments that occurred in Britain. The common themes of modernizing Victorian religion affected it: institutionalism and better organization; professionalization of clerical roles; refined services; and internal diversity.²³² This experience was not premised upon adaptation to any particular denominational model but was a general phenomenon, shared alike by Jews and Christians seeking to relativize religion. However, when Anglo-Jewry sought more detailed guidance for implementing these changes—organizational templates or clerical archetypes—it, as the historiography generally agrees, turned to the Established Church. This was a logical choice, predicated not so much upon religious considerations as the requirements of a minority identity. For a start, the effective, centralized and vertical Anglican authority structure suited the

²³² G. Parsons, 'Introduction: Victorian Religion, Paradox and Variety', in idem (ed.), *Religion in Victorian Britain*, 5 vols. (Manchester, 1988), i. 10.

needs of a small subculture seeking to maintain discipline and cohesion better than did the more diffuse and grass-roots organization of many dissenting congregations.²³³ A notable socio-economic compunction reinforced this. The Church was the spiritual home of the upper classes, whereas, in general, dissenting religions attracted the majority of their adherents from the middling or lower classes.²³⁴ The Anglo-Jewish elite, sensitive to British class conceptions and wishing to have their aspiring status reflected in their religion, naturally looked to emulate Anglican prestige. Overlying these considerations was the simple fact that Anglicanism was the dominant national pattern. The Church was part of the Establishment: headed by the monarch it remained a symbol of patriotism and English nationality. Affiliation with it could mitigate Jews' minority status.

It was logical, therefore, that Jewry acculturate to this model, which offered integration, rather than adopt one of the varieties—and their (continual) fragmentation would have proved another deterrent—of nonconformity that would only have reinforced their excluded position. Moreover, whilst there was no question of Anglo-Judaism appropriating Christian doctrine, no doubt the evangelical bent of most nonconformity provided a further disincentive. In contrast to the muted piety and broad theology that, in the main, characterized Anglican worship, the emphasis of dissenters upon uncompromising and particularly Christocentric doctrines—salvation, atonement, rebirth, justification by faith—would have been especially alienating to Jews.²³⁵

For these reasons it is also inappropriate to view Reform Judaism as the community's equivalent of dissent. Reform was non-expansive and London based; its upper-class congregants remained theologically conservative and were desirous of greater association with the surrounding socio-political order. Dissent was none of these things. Methodism might provide the best abstract comparison but purely because it remained the sect closest to Anglicanism, as Reform remained independent yet inter-linked with Orthodoxy in these decades. Recognizing this similitude, Anglo-Jews themselves tended to refer to Reform Jews as seceders, a term stressing institutional separation, rather than as dissenters, which implies more fundamental divergences of thought. 'We say it in all

²³³ Goulston, 'The Status', 64.

²³⁴ A. Gilbert, *Religion and Society in Industrial England: Church, Chapel and Social Change, 1740–1914* (New York, 1976), 61–2.

²³⁵ *Ibid.* 71, and D. Englander, 'The Word and the World: Evangelism in the Victorian City', in Parsons (ed.), *Religion in Victorian Britain*, ii. 18.

respect, there is probably less discrepancy between the Jews forming what are called Orthodox congregations, and those Jews who are members of the Reformed congregation of London, than is evident within the bosom of a single denomination of Christians,' claimed J. Picciotto.²³⁶

Finally, it is germane to note that, unsurprisingly, Anglo-Jewry never considered Catholicism as a viable religious example. Although the Catholic position in Britain came nearer to approaching Jewry's than any other Christian faith, with its 'foreign' traditions, large immigrant base, and internationality, Jews were not looking for solidarity in exclusion. The chiefly working-class, clerically organized, ever more aggressively continental, and anti-modern nature of British Catholicism had nothing to offer Anglo-Jewry.²³⁷

Whilst comparing Anglo-Jewry's religious existence with those of other British denominations it is relevant to briefly mention the contentious idea often applied to the general experience of all religions in modern Western history: the secularization thesis. Callum Brown's caution that religion has never achieved an 'ideal state' but has always adapted to evolving socio-economic contexts and such changes do not necessarily entail secularization—in terms of individual loss of belief or collective loss of social significance, independent of the growth or decline of ecclesiastical structures—should be borne in mind regarding the community.²³⁸ Anglo-Jews' dismissal of many Talmudic injunctions, for instance, need not imply a lack of piety but a readjustment of faith to better facilitate continuing belief in a changed world. Appreciating this, however, the community appears as a good example of many of the major elements within the secularization thesis.²³⁹ It experienced considerable social differentiation, as services previously incorporated within the religious sphere were separated and apportioned to specialist, non-religious institutions. Education was implemented through separate schools, and

²³⁶ J. Picciotto, *Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History* (London, 1875), 367.

²³⁷ G. Parsons, 'Victorian Roman Catholicism: Emancipation, Expansion and Achievement', in idem (ed.), *Religion in Victorian Britain*, i, 152–60. The sole area of positive identification between Jews and Catholics was the retention of non-vernacular services; as the *JC* mentioned in defence of Hebrew: 'The Roman Catholic Church prays in Latin, and there is something beautiful in preserving a separate language for prayer.' See *JC*, 23 Jan. 1885, 9.

²³⁸ C. Brown, 'A Revisionist Approach to Religious Change', in S. Bruce (ed.), *Religion and Modernisation: Sociologists and Historians Debate the Secularisation Thesis* (Oxford, 1992), 39.

²³⁹ These are taken from R. Wallis and S. Bruce, 'Secularisation: The Orthodox Model', in Bruce (ed.), *Religion and Modernisation*, 11–14.

often non-Jewish ones; the next chapter will discuss how charity was also withdrawn from the synagogue and systematized in a secular organization. Alongside this the community had seen the emergence of stratified class interests, which intruded upon the religious sphere so that socio-economic divisions often disrupted the unity of common faith. The second major aspect of secularization, societalization, would seem to be particularly relevant to the Jewish case. No other religion was so bounded within a community and no other, therefore, faced the dissolving dangers of integrating into mass society so sharply. The acculturation of Anglo-Jews, and the active participation of many in the Gentile society from which they had long been excluded, was no doubt a substantial cause of their increasingly nominal affiliation to Judaism. Rationalization, the last subdivision, was also widely apparent within post-emancipation Anglo-Judaism. It can be detected in many of the demands for ritual reform and the dismissive attitude to many obscure Talmudic rules, for example. What makes the concept of secularization particularly applicable to Anglo-Jewry is that the group also displayed classic signs of the countervailing factors the thesis accepts sustained religions: cultural defence and cultural transition.²⁴⁰ The former applies to the established community that suffered little fragmentation, lost few members to conversion, and still centred its socio-cultural world within Jewry. The latter was experienced by many Jewish immigrants, who often used religion to provide a familiar environment whilst adjusting to a new society, and revitalized the general communal standard by doing so. With its post-emancipation development Anglo-Jewry underwent a process of secularization that fits the orthodox thesis well and indicates its applicability to all modern, Western religions, rather than just Christian ones.

²⁴⁰ Ibid. 17–18.

5

Immigrants and Exhibitions

Expanding the Boundaries of British Jewry

I

The decade between 1880 and 1890 witnessed developments that dramatically and permanently altered the situation of the Anglo-Jewish minority in Britain. It marked the end of the immediate post-emancipation era for British Jews. The emancipated definition of Jewry as a religious confession, with space for a malleable if understated particularity, would afterwards no longer characterize the community. The decade's events ended this stage of Jewish consciousness; Anglo-Jews would emerge with a changed conception of their identity. This chapter will explore a variety of factors, both Jewish and non-Jewish, that contributed to this transformation and their ramifications upon the minority. Undoubtedly most significant was the mass immigration of Jews from the Russian Empire. Between 1881 and 1914, some 2.5–2.75 million Jews fleeing violent anti-Semitic persecution, alongside harsh economic and political discrimination, left Eastern Europe. An estimated 500,000 spent at least two years in Britain during this period as transmigrants, with approximately 120,000–150,000 of these settling.¹ These Jewish immigrants caused a sensation in British society. Inhabiting overcrowded areas of East London or cramped provincial cities, engaging in labour-intensive trades, and being conspicuously foreign in an age of growing nationalism, their presence became a social and political controversy that made Jews topical, and eventually led to the 1905 Aliens Act.²

¹ T. Kushner and K. Knox, *Refugees in an Age of Genocide: Global, National and Local Perspectives during the Twentieth Century* (London, 1999), 19.

² S. Hochberg, 'The Jewish Community and the Aliens Question in Great Britain, 1881–1917' (Ph.D. thesis, University of New York, 1989), 136–7.

For the Anglo-Jewish community the immigration was a revolution. The approximately 60,000 Anglo-Jews of 1881 were deluged. By 1914 only one in four Jews would be a native. Many provincial communities rapidly expanded as their Jewish population—20,000 in 1881—swelled 50 per cent by 1891, increasing their independence and investing them with much greater significance within the minority.³ Although historians such as Bill Williams have cautioned against seeing this immigration as a distinct break in the evolution of all provincial Jewry, preferring, in his Manchester example, to view it as the culmination of a long history of continuous immigration that had created notable communities since the mid 1840s, for most provincials the immigration of the 1880s marked a decisive turning point in their development.⁴ Ernest Krauz, for instance, has examined how this influx very suddenly transformed Leeds Jewry from an anodyne group of congregations to the leading provincial community after Manchester; its population exploding from an estimated 1,000 in 1871 to possibly 25,000 by 1911, when it would constitute 5.8 per cent of the city's entire inhabitants.⁵

This extraneously derived population explosion had a massive impact upon the character of Anglo-Jewry. The immigrants, many coming from bounded Jewish communities, having had restricted contact with surrounding Gentile environments, traditionally Orthodox, and largely from poor or pauperized economic conditions, were exceedingly different Jews from the emancipated British variety. 'The Russian Jew is among us, but not of us. His dress, his food, his habits, his speech, his mode of prayer, are near as possible here what they were in the half-civilized village in which he was born,' despaired the *JC*.⁶ Significant cultural, religious, and class disparities existed between the Eastern European newcomers and the native community. The immigrants' customs and practices were viewed negatively by the Anglo-Jewish elite, who feared for their carefully constructed equal identity and the possible regression of the Jewish image in Britain.⁷ Invariably, though, as the resident community was numerically swamped, the immigrants began

³ V. Lipman, *Social History of the Jews in England, 1850–1950* (London, 1954), 103.

⁴ B. Williams, *The Making of Manchester Jewry, 1740–1875* (Manchester, 1985), 328.

⁵ E. Krauz, *Leeds Jewry: Its History and Social Structure* (Cambridge, 1964), 28, and G. Alderman, *Modern British Jewry*, 2nd edn. (Oxford, 1998), 119.

⁶ *JC*, 12 Dec. 1884, 11.

⁷ One aspect of immigrant life that was widely viewed as a rare positive was their greater piety, even if all the expressions of this were not necessarily appreciated. See H. Adler, *The Ideal Jewish Pastor* (London, 1891), 17; O. Simon, *Faith and Experience: A Selection of Essays and Addresses* (London, 1895), 156; and *JW*, 9 Jan. 1885, 5.

to transmute the minority and, consequently, Gentiles' perception of it. This did not happen instantly. It was not clear at first how long the migration might continue or how much Britain might be involved with it. But by the mid 1880s the scale and continuing nature of the movement began to be appreciated and its transforming effects upon Anglo-Jewish life, while taking longer to manifest, were increasingly evident.

One aspect of the Anglo-Jewish community that was quickly modified by the immigrants' presence was its economic profile. For most of the nineteenth century, and particularly the post-emancipation decades, the Jewish community had followed a trend of steady embourgeoisement. In the early 1850s Vivian Lipman has estimated that a third of the community were middle class, and by the 1880s this proportion had risen to half.⁸ This meant that the community contained a larger proportion of middle-class people than did the general population.⁹ Joseph Jacobs, the communal statistician, surveying London's approximately 46,000 Jews in 1883, illustrated this more clearly in his estimate of the community's economic strata; see Table 5.1 below.

There had been a concomitant decrease in lower-order occupations formerly associated with Jews. Hawking and petty and itinerant street trading had dramatically declined as Jewish activities over the Victorian era. The *JC* noted in 1864 that the trade in old clothes and oranges, formerly a Jewish monopoly, was being taken over by the Irish, though not from want of aptitude: 'We believe this is the gratifying effect of educational efforts which have been made for a number of years in the London Jewish community. The decline of the trades referred to among the Jews, far from being the subject of regret, is rather a matter of congratulation.'¹⁰ Writing in 1867 the Gentile commentator Joseph Stallard supported this assertion, observing that the cry of 'old clo', long used to satirize and stigmatize the Jewish poor, was much less commonly heard than previously.¹¹ At the other end of the economic spectrum, Jewish fortunes also advanced. Jacobs thought London in

⁸ Lipman, *Social History*, 78. The experience of embourgeoisement was common to most Western European Jewish communities, accompanying the trend toward complete emancipation over the nineteenth century. See D. Feldman, 'Was Modernity Good for the Jews?', in B. Cheyette and L. Marcus (eds.), *Modernity, Culture and 'the Jew'* (Cambridge, 1998), 173.

⁹ H. Pollins, *Economic History of the Jews of England* (London 1982), 90.

¹⁰ *JC*, 2 Dec. 1864, 3.

¹¹ J. Stallard, *London Pauperism amongst the Jews and Christians: An Inquiry into the Principles and Practice of Outdoor Relief in the Metropolis and the Result upon the Moral and Physical Condition of the Pauper Class* (London, 1867), 9.

Table 5.1 Estimate of Jewish economic interests in London, 1883

Position	Number (inc. family members)
Professionals and retired living in West	1,200
Rich merchants living in the West	5,400
Merchants with private houses, North, East, South	3,600
Professionals and retired, North, East, South	800
Shopkeepers, etc.	15,000
Petty traders recently on the Guardians	8,000
Servants and assistants	1,000
On Guardians as casual or chronic poor	7,911
Other paupers and afflicted	2,242
Russian refugees	947

Source: J. Jacobs, *Studies in Jewish Statistics, Social, Vital and Anthropometric* (London, 1891), 13. Jacobs based these estimates upon research from trade directories, charity figures, burial returns, school numbers, and location of synagogue memberships. He admitted that his figures might contain substantial inaccuracies, as often he was forced to rely on the speculative probability that someone with a Jewish name was a Jew.

1891 'probably the richest Jewish city in the world', estimating that it contained a third of all Jewish millionaires.¹² William Rubinstein has calculated that Jewish top wealth holders rose to a peak of 23 per cent of non-landed millionaires deceased during the decade 1910–19, making it probable that many of these Jews actively obtained their wealth during the latter post-emancipation decades.¹³ At the end of the post-emancipation era, Anglo-Jewry was an upwardly mobile economic community: increasingly prosperous, increasingly middle class, and topped by an exceedingly rich elite.

This success was achieved within a narrow occupational structure. At the top end of the spectrum this saw wealthy Jews concentrated in

¹² J. Jacobs, *Studies in Jewish Statistics, Social, Vital and Anthropometric* (London, 1891), 11.

¹³ W. Rubinstein, 'Jews among Top British Wealth Holders, 1857–1969: Decline of the Golden Age', *JSS* 34/1 (1972), 76.

financial areas, especially the stock exchange and merchant banking.¹⁴ At the opposite extreme, according to the Jewish Board of Guardians (JBG):

the great bulk of our lower classes follow occupations of a most precarious nature. Labourers, artisans, or skilled workman in the various trades are excessively rare, and where we can point with pride to a watchmaker, a boot-maker, or a bookbinder here and there at long intervals, we notice with regret a vast company of cigar-makers, cap and slipper makers, clothes-renovators, itinerant glaziers, sellers of fruit in the streets, and shoe-blacks.¹⁵

A small Jewish professional class was developing toward the end of the century but the minority's restricted occupational situation was compounded and exacerbated by the East European immigrants. Their arrival reset the pattern of economic progress. If not poor or unskilled upon entry, the immigrants were quickly proletarianized in London, where their pre-industrial economic experiences were long outmoded.¹⁶ As a result, they were forced into the already overstocked trades the Jewish poor had long occupied; by 1901, 42 per cent of Polish and Russian men and 52 per cent of women in London were engaged in the tailoring industry.¹⁷ Although the newcomers rapidly adapted and soon began participating in Anglo-Jewry's embourgeoisement, their sheer numbers radically altered the economic composition of the community, reverting its diamond-shaped class structure back to a bottom-heavy pyramid.¹⁸ For the first time in many decades the majority of the community were located among the working class.

Anglo-Jewish institutions had been trying to obviate the communal poor's occupational constriction throughout the post-emancipation decades. Encouraging the apprenticeship of Jewish youth to more remunerative and stable trades, particularly toward the end of the 1870s when immigration began to substantially increase, was viewed as the most viable solution by the various Jewish Boards of Guardians established

¹⁴ Pollins, *Economic History*, 108.

¹⁵ University of Southampton Library, MS 173 1/12/1, Archives of Jewish Care: Jewish Board of Guardians: Scheme for and Reports of, 1859–65, Annual Report, 1865, 59.

¹⁶ Hochberg, 'Jewish Community', 85–7.

¹⁷ G. Alderman, 'English Jews or Jews of the English Persuasion? Reflections on the Emancipation of Anglo-Jewry', in P. Birnbaum and I. Katznelson (eds.), *Paths of Emancipation: Jews, States, and Citizenship* (Chichester, 1995), 141.

¹⁸ D. Englander, 'Booth's Jews: The Presentation of Jews and Judaism in *Life and Labour of the People in London*', *Victorian Studies*, 32/4 (Summer 1989), 566.

in London and several major provincial cities. In 1875, the London Guardians founded an Apprenticing Department. It was not a great success. Managing to place seventeen boys in its first year, it had improved to eighty-five youths four years later.¹⁹ This level of activity did little to relieve the problem. The JBG acknowledged severe impediments against which its efforts made little headway: 'The greatest difficulty encountered by the committee is the small number of Jewish masters in general trades, to which it would be advisable to apprentice Jewish youths.'²⁰ The Liverpool Guardians admitted a similar lack of progress, citing a problem perhaps more intractable than the paucity of masters: 'The difficulty is to overcome the very natural, but short-sighted prejudices of the parents, who are averse to apprenticing their children because of the somewhat long period during which their labour must be unremunerative.'²¹ Similar problems beset the Manchester Guardians' attempts, which between 1875 and 1900 managed to apprentice only three or four dozen boys.²² These unsuccessful apprenticing exertions were merely a small facet of the charitable endeavours Anglo-Jewry had employed since the Resettlement to ameliorate the condition of their poor. Expanded during the post-emancipation period, philanthropic activities would be at the forefront of elite attempts to manage the immigration.

Charity and philanthropy were considered extremely important by Anglo-Jews, who inherited strong imperatives to such benevolence from both their Jewish and British identities. Poverty, the *JC* proclaimed in March 1865, 'is a serious fact in its civil aspect; a solemn question in connection with our religious obligations. Not as citizens, not as men, but especially not as Jews, do we dare dismiss it from attention.'²³ A sphere of activity compelled by their intertwined personas was supported not just with words but substantial action. Jacobs estimated that there existed forty-seven charitable institutions in 1891 designed solely to succour London Jews and supported at a cost of at least £37,000 per annum.²⁴ Besides prodigious confessional work, Anglo-Jews, as Englishmen, also tended to generously donate time and money to

¹⁹ University of Southampton Library, MS 173 1/12/3, JBG Annual Reports, 1873–9, Annual Report, 1875, 75. and Annual Report, 1879, 15.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, Annual Report, 1875, 75.

²¹ University of Southampton Library, MS 116/141, Small Jewish Collections, Board of Guardians for the Relief of the Jewish Poor of Liverpool, Annual Report, June 1878–May 1879, 4.

²² R. Liedtke, *Jewish Welfare in Hamburg and Manchester, c.1850–1914* (Oxford, 1998), 92.

²³ *JC*, 10 Mar. 1865, 4.

²⁴ Jacobs, *Studies*, 17.

non-denominational and national causes. Doubtless, this was in part seen as an integrative measure, in terms of both class and community. Like dissenters and Catholics before them, Jews (successfully) utilized beneficence to promote their acculturation.²⁵ For wealthy Jews this had the further purpose of demonstrating their appropriate behaviour as members of the British upper classes. But as Abigail Green cautions in her treatment of nineteenth-century Jewry's greatest philanthropist, Sir Moses Montefiore, such utilitarian considerations were seldom the whole or even primary motivation actuating Jewish generosity.²⁶ Jews were already well integrated, and their impulse to aid fellow countrymen regardless of creed can be attributed to their English feelings of responsibility and sympathy. Certainly, by the post-emancipation era they were acting as Englishmen, rather than trying to become Englishmen.

Anglo-Jewish charity had undergone considerable reorganization, both in principle and methodology, after the achievement of emancipation. A shift occurred from an approach established upon traditional Jewish concepts, ad hoc and universal in relief, to a more systematic strategy, incorporating many contemporary British notions. The concrete manifestation of this was the 1859 establishment of a Jewish Board of Guardians. Operating parallel to municipal authorities, the JBG sought to organize all necessary aspects of communal charity with the twin aims of ensuring that no Jew became a burden to the state and that the conscientious were not deprived of relief by arrangements 'not calculated to meet the peculiar exigencies of the Jewish poor'.²⁷ The *JC* hoped the organization would effect their wish for 'the elevation of

²⁵ F. Prochaska, 'Philanthropy', in F. Thompson (ed.), *The Cambridge Social History of Britain, 1750–1950*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, 1990), iii. 378. The generosity regardless of creed of individuals such as Moses Montefiore and David Salomons was praised during the emancipation campaign by Gentile supporters, such as Lord John Russell, who adduced it as another reason Jews deserved equality: see I. Finstein, 'The Struggle for Emancipation, 1828–1858', in idem, *Jewish Society in Victorian England* (London, 1993), 48.

²⁶ A. Green, 'Rethinking Sir Moses Montefiore: Religion, Nationhood and International Philanthropy in the Nineteenth Century', *American Historical Review*, 110/3 (June 2005), 648–9.

²⁷ *JC*, 4 Oct. 1861, 4. The Guardians' remit had initially extended only to relieving the foreign poor, and although in practice it administered to all applicants regardless of origin from the start, it was not until January 1871 that USyn officially transferred responsibility for all of the community's poor to it: see LMA, ACC/2712/02/001, USP, Report of the Overseers' Committee for the Relief of the Poor of the United Synagogue, Jan. 1871, 13.

benevolence into a science'.²⁸ Echoing ideas of 'scientific philanthropy' prominent in mid Victorian thought and championed by the Charity Organization Society, to which the JBG sent a representative, rather than the indiscriminate ethos that governed the Poor Law Boards, the Anglo-Jewish elite believed the requirements of charity had altered with societal development.²⁹ Eleemosynary aid alone was thought no longer adequate. The impoverished now needed encouragement and moralizing, and the Guardians created a variety of departments designed to alleviate all the ill effects of poverty: the Sanitary Committee recommended hygiene improvements, the Industrial Committee encouraged self-assistance through small loans, the Medicine Department sought to improve health, and the Visiting Committee demonstrated moral elevation.

The fundamental understanding underlying these actions was a belief that poverty was curable. There would always be poor but pauperism was a condition that could be eradicated with appropriate treatment. Quintessential to this was the differentiation of the destitute into the deserving and undeserving. The Mendicity Department, which kept records upon all current and former relief applicants, so that the philanthropically inclined might research cases before giving privately and thus avoid the 'self-elected pauper', was considered one of the most important of the institution.³⁰ The communal elite sought to change both donor and recipient attitudes: 'A large mass of the poor will have to be broken of the habit of applying at once for relief. . . They will have to unlearn the notion that to be a *yudekeend* is sufficient claim to be indulged in idleness and beggary', whilst 'the benevolent people will have to unlearn giving indiscriminate charity. . . and will have to learn the very grave lesson that the thoughtless charitable person, giving to every applicant without previous inquiry, is as injurious to society as the miser refusing aid even to the most meritorious'.³¹

These ideas were taken up across the community, even gaining precedence in religious charity. Over 1873–5, for instance, the United Synagogue overhauled its ancient practice of Matzo flour distribution to better embody this contemporary thinking. Traditionally, flour was

²⁸ *JC*, 18 Nov. 1870, 4.

²⁹ D. Cesarani, *The Jewish Chronicle and Anglo-Jewry, 1841–1991* (Cambridge, 1994), 58, and *JW*, 26 Nov. 1880, 5.

³⁰ University of Southampton Library, MS 173 1/12/1, JBG Scheme for and Reports of, 1859–65, Half-Yearly Report 1860, 8.

³¹ *JC*, 18 Mar. 1859, 4.

dispensed to all who applied, but an investigation revealed that a 'regular repetition of cases', who were not in need, nevertheless sought the boon as a perceived right of synagogue membership.³² Admitting a feeling that perhaps such a religious duty 'is not to be governed by the ordinary rules of charity', the authorities, fearing they 'had fostered a special habit of improvidence, and a feeling of dependence', decided to restrict provision to persons in 'absolute want', whilst encouraging the formation of a savings cooperative among members to facilitate self-sufficiency.³³ In its first year of operation, this saw applications decrease by 600 and saved USyn about £400.³⁴

These developments represented a significant increase in contemporary English input into the combined identity area of British Jewish charity. Some historians, most notably Mordecai Rozin, have highlighted this shift to suggest that the post-emancipation, Anglicized elite had appropriated philanthropy to serve as an instrument of class control, to the detriment of its Jewish roots. Believing the elite to have forsaken the universal duty of traditional charity and welfare, *tzedakah*, Rozin asserts that organizations like the JBG were 'controlling mechanisms . . . designed and continuously directed to enforce upper-class interests throughout the nineteenth century'.³⁵ The Anglo-Jewish leadership did have class-bound attitudes that displayed a blend of disdain, pity, and patronization towards the poor. 'They are like children, always needing a helping hand and watchful eye,' thought the *JC* in 1883.³⁶ A year later Hermann Adler concurred: 'you must think and act for him. You must consider how he can be made to earn an honourable living.'³⁷ Notwithstanding this approach, Joseph Stallard defended Anglo-Jewish relief as more humane and efficient than that of the parish: 'it is clear that the Jews are stealing a march on the Christians around

³² LMA, ACC/2712/02/001, USP, Report of the Overseers' Committee on the Matzo Distribution to the Poor, 1873, 185.

³³ *Ibid.* 185. To effect an even more coherent and efficient system, the USyn invited the Sephardic congregation to merge its distribution services with its efforts; the offer was declined, see Maida Vale Synagogue, Spanish and Portuguese Jews Records, MS 116, Minutes of the Meetings of the *Mahamad*, 1874–90, xiii. 3.

³⁴ LMA, ACC/2712/02/001, USP, Report of the Overseers on the Matzo Distribution for 1875, 270.

³⁵ M. Rozin, *The Rich and the Poor: Jewish Philanthropy and Social Control in Nineteenth-Century London* (Brighton, 1999), 2, 136, 217.

³⁶ *JC*, 8 June 1883, 9.

³⁷ H. Adler, *The Purpose and Methods of Charitable Relief: Two Sermons Preached at the Bayswater Synagogue* (London, 1884), 5.

them.³⁸ Overall, though, it is apparent that Jewish charity partook of social manipulation as much as its Gentile compeers, especially the JBG, whose beneficiaries were ‘made to feel the opprobrium of poverty’.³⁹

Despite this, Rozin’s argument is overstated and unbalanced; too concerned with negative perceptions of elite motives, it does not offer an objective account of their intra-Jewish charity, in which moral responsibility and concern for poor co-religionists was prominent. The Jewish Guardians’ *raison d’être* was, after all, to succour the Jewish indigent. ‘If our poor are not to be handed over to the parish or to the unsectarian societies, the Board must exist to relieve them.’⁴⁰ Whilst this realization was partly founded upon a long-held belief that it would irreparably damage the minority’s image if Jewish paupers came upon the rates, in spite of Jews’ contributions to them, it was more compassionately (and, from a communal leadership viewpoint, responsibly) concerned with providing assistance acceptable to their scruples and preserving them within Judaism. In 1861 the JBG considered the situation of ‘permanent paupers’: the disabled, widowed, orphaned, ‘who gradually found their way to the workhouses, and came by degrees lost and forgotten’.⁴¹ In a decision that prioritized Jewish concerns over the dictates of economy and social science, the Guardians decided to support these cases with doles, rather than abandon them to irreligious conditions:

It would be asked, and with reason, to what purpose could a Board of Guardians specially appointed to watch over the religious and moral interests, and protect the wants of the Jewish poor, direct the funds entrusted to its care more beneficially, than to the support of those, who by the dispensation of providence, had become physically unable to support themselves; and the Board itself feels, that it would certainly lose the confidence of the public, as well as its own self-esteem, if it permitted a single case of a Jewish pauper to sink into the oblivion of the workhouse, while the funds at its disposal remained unexhausted.⁴²

³⁸ Stallard, *London Pauperism*, 174. Stallard’s intention was to highlight the deficiencies in general poor law provision by contrasting this system with Jewish charity. He is thus notably biased in favour of the JBG’s activities. This does not, however, prevent his work from usefully making comparisons between the two systems.

³⁹ E. Black, *The Social Politics of Anglo-Jewry, 1880–1920* (Oxford, 1988), 73.

⁴⁰ *JC*, 10 Dec. 1880, 9.

⁴¹ University of Southampton Library, MS 173 1/12/1, JBG Scheme for and Reports of, 1859–65, Annual Report 1861, 19.

⁴² *Ibid.* 19. Upon this resolution the Board voted 24 fixed allowances. By 1873, this number had risen to 155 monthly allowances and 123 fixed weekly allowances: see MS 173 1/12/3, JBG Annual Reports, 1873–9, Annual Report 1873, 12.

Jewish philanthropy took its commitments to the minority seriously.

Further evidence of this is provided by the repeated attempts of the JBG to convince its Gentile equivalents to accommodate Jewish particularities. The Whitechapel Union was persuaded to provide kosher food for its Jewish inmates in 1871. Such an arrangement had existed in Manchester since 1869, and for the entire post-emancipation period the JBG lobbied the Metropolitan Guardians to apply outdoor relief, rather than the workhouse test, to Jewish paupers.⁴³ The desire for such religious concessions had nothing to do with social control. Such actions, alongside the JBG's separate, parallel organization, did, however, emphasize Jewish peculiarity; demonstrating, in contrast to emancipation's logic, that Jews could not participate in the standard but required specialized arrangements. This was not necessarily problematic, though, as the vast majority of British charities were denominationally based. Jewry was merely copying the prevailing tendency:

here in England it is the religion and not the state which takes charge of these ministrations, and that whilst all religious communities, or as many of them as can consistently join, perform united the social duties devolving upon them jointly, each then separately has to provide for its special social wants.⁴⁴

The organization, centralization, and impressive exertions of Jewish charity in this age, whatever its purposes, did not lead to the hoped-for mitigation of communal poverty. There was some initial success. The Guardians claimed in 1873, when two-thirds of previous applicants did not reapply, that pauperism had both relatively and absolutely decreased.⁴⁵ But by the end of this decade and the beginning of the next, significant problems were becoming apparent. Escalating Jewish immigration, coupled with an economic downturn, strained the resources of the minority. Lionel Cohen, President of the Guardians, bemoaned the institution's lack of funds in 1880, when it was forced to obtain an advance of £800: 'It might seem that the Board, holding, as it does, a unique position among the charitable organizations of this community, ought to be saved from the necessity of having, year after year, to beg, cap in hand, for aid in order to meet the ordinary

⁴³ L. Magnus, *The Jewish Board of Guardians and the Men Who Made It, 1859–1909* (London, 1909), 133, and *JC*, 12 Feb. 1869, 6.

⁴⁴ *JC*, 8 Apr. 1859, 4.

⁴⁵ University of Southampton Library, MS 173 1/12/3, JBG Annual Reports, 1873–9, Annual Report 1873, 10.

demands upon its resources.⁴⁶ This was a nationwide challenge for Jewish charity. The Liverpool *Guardians* reported similarly in 1880: an increase in applications, a concomitant rise in expenditure, but a £47 decline in ordinary income that required a special gift from Baroness Lionel de Rothschild to prevent a deficit.⁴⁷ The Liverpool charity attributed this deterioration to depression of trade and severity of winter, though its statistics on recipients' nationality reveal the paramount cause: of 180 cases, only sixteen were English.⁴⁸

When the mass immigration of Eastern European Jews got under way, Anglo-Jewish charitable structures were overwhelmed. Notwithstanding a rule denying immigrants aid during the first six months of their residence, the JBG calculated that 98 per cent of its applicants were foreigners by 1886.⁴⁹ A year before, in his annual appeal for funds, Lionel Cohen was forced to disclose that 'at present *the Board of Guardians is absolutely in debt*'.⁵⁰ And in debt it would stay for the next three decades, as between 1881 and 1914 the number of claims upon it annually increased by 200 per cent.⁵¹ By 1905, the JBG was forced to establish an emergency fund simply to liquidate its arrears, which exceeded £6,000.⁵² Anglo-Jewish charity could not cope with the immigration. Its post-emancipation optimism that poverty was curable gave way in the mid 1880s to modest hopes of palliating the worst aspects of immigrant destitution and concerns of institutional survival. Jewish indigence soared to levels not experienced for nearly a century. The progressive and middle-class image of emancipated Anglo-Jewry was tarnished by the immigrants' stubborn poverty, which created what the *JC* termed a distinct 'communal embarrassment'.⁵³

The immigrations' economic impact had equivalent social ramifications upon the minority. The integrative pattern that had quietly prevailed for most of the nineteenth century was abruptly reversed. Pre-emancipation, the upper tier of Anglo-Jewry had penetrated the highest echelons of British society; their acculturated socio-cultural condition being a prime justification for demanding equality. After 1858, social

⁴⁶ *JC*, 10 Dec. 1880, 9.

⁴⁷ University of Southampton Library, MS 116/141, Small Jewish Collections, Board of Guardians for the Relief of the Jewish Poor of Liverpool, Annual Report, June 1879–May 1880, 6.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.* 7, and Annual Report, June 1878–May 1879, 3.

⁴⁹ *JC*, 12 Feb. 1886, 9. ⁵⁰ *JW*, 4 Dec. 1885, 3. Emphasis in original.

⁵¹ Alderman, 'English Jews', 142.

⁵² *JC*, 7 July 1905, 2. ⁵³ *Ibid.* 22 Jan. 1886, 9.

integration accelerated for all classes of Jews. The wealthy, of course, continued to lead the way. In 1873, Albert Edward, the Prince of Wales, wrote in thanks to Anthony de Rothschild and his wife for a week of 'kindness and hospitality': 'my only regret is to have been forced to leave you this afternoon.'⁵⁴ Such an event was not uncommon. The Prince was genuinely friendly with a remarkable number of the Jewish elite, in particular, at this time, the Rothschild family, and there can be no greater example of the successful acceptance of upper-class English Jews than this royal affection. But this relationship was merely the peak. The Jewish elite mixed freely and on equal terms with all the worthies of the day—literary, political, or aristocratic. T. H. S. Escott, in an anonymous discussion of the London scene, observed the social prominence of Jews: 'There is no phenomenon more noticeable in London society than the ascendancy of the Jews. . . . His Royal Highness regards the best class of Hebrews with conspicuous favour. In that, as in other matters, he sets a fashion.'⁵⁵

David Cesarani thinks that by the mid 1880s, Jews had become intrinsic to the country's social fabric; an opinion borne out by contemporary evidence.⁵⁶ For although in private many upper-class Gentiles expressed cultural misgivings about parvenu Jews, and aristocrats could be suspicious of their international, plutocratic fortunes, in public behaviour and interaction Jews were treated as equal Englishmen.⁵⁷ An article in the *Pictorial World* on Sir Moses Montefiore declared: 'It would be difficult to select from the muster-roll of our notabilities one who is more thoroughly a representative man than this eminent Jewish Baronet.'⁵⁸ The conclusive proof of Gentile acceptance came, for Anglo-Jewry, with the elevation of Nathaniel de Rothschild to the peerage in 1885. Arthur Cohen thought the event 'marks the complete attainment by the Jews of England of *all* political and social rights and privileges'.⁵⁹ Nathaniel's aunt Louisa remarked on the equanimity of the

⁵⁴ University of Southampton Library, MS 43 Letters to members of the Rothschild family, 1863–1925, Letter from Albert Edward, the Prince of Wales, to Anthony de Rothschild, 10 Jan. 1873.

⁵⁵ A Foreign Resident [T. H. S. Escott], *Society in London* (London, 1885), 87.

⁵⁶ Cesarani, *Jewish Chronicle*, 69.

⁵⁷ D. Cannadine, *The Decline and Fall of the British Aristocracy* (London, 1998), 91, and T. Endelman, 'The Frankaus of London: A Study in Radical Assimilation, 1837–1967', *Jewish History*, 8/1–2 (1994), 146.

⁵⁸ *Pictorial World*, 3 Apr. 1875, 83.

⁵⁹ LMA, ACC/3121/G1/01/002, BDAR, 1880–9, Annual Report, Apr. 1886, 32. Emphasis in original.

occasion: 'What changes in the last forty years, when the . . . title barely would have appeared on the envelope of a begging letter—now causes not one surprising or deferential exclamation.'⁶⁰ Jewry had made it.

This generational difference in social integration across the post-emancipation decades applied to and was recognized among the middle and lower classes, as well. The *JC* pondered this at length in 1886:

The younger Jew, who has enjoyed all the educational and social advantages which, thanks to modern toleration and modern generosity, are now open to him, perceives the unsatisfactory nature of a limited range of society. He may spend the greater part of his time with his Gentile friends. . . . The ghetto barriers have been completely levelled and a new stream of life has rushed in upon us. . . . In many cases the difference between generation and generation is so great, as to be described as of kind rather than of degree. It is not a mere difference of size; the younger men are not only so far ahead of their elders as the advance of the times has made inevitable; they are on a completely different plane of culture.⁶¹

Stark geographical evidence existed to reinforce such perceptions; for as Jewry operated increasingly within Gentile orbits, so the solidity of the Jewish group waned. All classes of London Jew had for centuries been concentrated in several East End districts, but over the nineteenth century this residential cohesion dissolved.⁶² Anglo-Jewry dispersed across the capital, following the class pattern of their Christian peers. The wealthiest constructed country estates, the rich and middle classes moved ever westward; the east was abandoned to the lower orders.

There is a danger of exaggerating Anglo-Jewish social integration in the Victorian era. A strong sense of solidarity still existed; particularly among the middle and lower classes, who, reinforced by a constricted occupational structure, often continued to keep apart from Gentile circles, many practising what Jacobs termed 'shoolism': an inclination to limit acquaintances, especially friends, to the members of their own synagogue.⁶³ New forms of Jewish association were also to develop in this period, as Jews with few close personal associations to the community sought to demonstrate their attachment. In 1891, for instance, a group

⁶⁰ L. Cohen (ed.), *The Journal of Lady de Rothschild, 1837–1854 and 1867–1906* (London, 1932), 210.

⁶¹ *JC*, 3 Sept. 1886, 9.

⁶² Williams, *Making of Manchester Jewry*, 336.

⁶³ T. Endelman, *Radical Assimilation in English Jewish History, 1656–1945* (Bloomington, Ind., 1990), 92, and 'Making Jews Modern: Some Jewish and Gentile Misunderstandings in the Age of Emancipation', in M. Raphael (ed.), *What is Modern about the Modern Jewish Experience?* (Williamsburg, Va., 1997), 24.

of young Jewish professionals formed the Maccabaeans ‘with the object of bringing together Jews who are interested in literature, science, artistic or professional pursuits’.⁶⁴ Nevertheless, the dissipation of Jewish society and its assimilation to Christian mores had proceeded to the extent that the *JC* began fearing for Judaism’s loss of adhesive power.⁶⁵ The *JW* was similarly anxious by the mid 1880s:

We hope we are giving utterance to no ‘tribal’ sentiment, when we say that we much prefer that young Jewish men and women should form their own literary societies than be dependent on those established and managed by non-Jews. Our unhampered intercourse with the Gentile has already broken down too many of the barriers which separate Jews from Gentiles.⁶⁶

Ironically, just as the communal press were fretting over dissolution, Jewish immigrant settlement was regressing the minority’s social condition to an older and less welcome version. The Russian immigrant was crowded into the East End, making significant parts of it exclusively Jewish once again. With little or no knowledge of Gentile culture—certainly no English habits—and unlikely to speak the language proficiently, while garbed in traditional apparel, immigrant neighbourhoods quickly began to resemble, as Inspector Reid and Sergeant Trench explained to the Booth survey team, a foreign town.⁶⁷ There was little mixing of nationalities and Jewish areas tended to be completely segregated, constituting, in effect, a wall-less ghetto. By 1900, the segregation in parts of east London was so distinct that the Toynbee Hall investigators Russell and Lewis could produce a map illustrating the ‘well-defined intensely Jewish districts’ expanding around the Whitechapel Road.⁶⁸ David Englander states that, apart from possessing more obvious characteristics, the Jewish immigrants, in both scale and concentration, were a far more identifiably distinct group than any other, such as the Irish.⁶⁹ Native Jews deplored the situation of ‘whole streets in Mile End crowded with these hapless paupers in every phase of dirt and wretchedness’.⁷⁰ This, they realized, presented the spectacle of Jewish separatism decades of acculturation had sought to dispel. Soon, the majority of Jews in Britain would have only the most limited of social interaction with the surrounding Gentile environment.

⁶⁴ Cesarani, *Jewish Chronicle*, 90.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶⁶ *JW*, 23 Jan. 1885, 3.

⁶⁷ Englander, ‘Booth’s Jews’, 566.

⁶⁸ C. Russell and H. Lewis, *The Jew in London: A Study of Racial Character and Present-Day Conditions* (London, 1900), p. xxxviii.

⁶⁹ Englander, ‘Booth’s Jews’, 552.

⁷⁰ *JC*, 26 Nov. 1886, 6.

II

The potential consequences of this upon Jews' relationship with the majority society worried Anglo-Jewry. As the immigration continued and it became evident that thousands of foreign Jews would permanently settle in Britain, the Anglo-Jewish elite began to fear for the community's acculturated identity. Heirs to a long-standing tradition of collective responsibility, British Jews realized their image was inextricably linked to that of the immigrants: 'Our fair fame is bound up with theirs; the outside world is not capable of making minute discriminations between Jew and Jew, and forms its opinions of Jews in general as much, if not more, from them than from the anglicized portion of the community.'⁷¹ This stimulated efforts to promote a positive perception of the newcomers, garner sympathy for their plight, and promote the benefits to Britain of free immigration and asylum. The intention was to convince the public that, as Charles Emmanuel would later explain to the 1902 Royal Commission on Alien Immigration, the Jewish immigrant was exceptional, that unlike other foreigners he came to England to be English, rather than to get rich and leave.⁷² To ensure the truth of this assertion, the community embarked upon aggressive programmes of repatriation and Anglicization. David Feldman estimates that between 1881 and 1906 the JBG alone returned some 31,000 persons to Eastern Europe.⁷³ This massive operation was undertaken in an attempt to moderate the number of settlers and, more importantly, to remove those considered particularly unsuitable: 'A man who shows himself incapable of becoming a good citizen ought to be expelled.'⁷⁴ Repatriation was executed with little regard for the Jews involved, who were often returned to disturbed areas, receiving no assistance at the other end; in 1883, the *Guardians* reported the return of 419 cases 'probably to their homes'.⁷⁵

⁷¹ *Ibid.* 12 Aug. 1881, 9.

⁷² *Parliamentary Reports from Commissioners* 1903, ix, Report on the Royal Commission on Alien Immigration, 602.

⁷³ D. Feldman, 'The Importance of Being English: Jewish Immigration and the Decay of Liberal England', in D. Feldman and G. Jones (eds.), *Metropolis London: Histories and Representations since 1800* (London, 1989), 63.

⁷⁴ *Parliamentary Reports from Commissioners* 1903, ix, 530.

⁷⁵ University of Southampton Library, MS 173 1/12/4, JBG Annual Reports 1880–6, Annual Report 1883, 17. Repatriation, with its intention of removing the least useful,

Those foreign Jews who remained were subjected to various measures of Anglicization. Some form of acculturation was inevitable as immigrant Jews adapted to their new environment but Anglo-Jewry sought to direct this, to impose their model upon the newcomers. Whilst there were benefits—assistance with learning English, provision of free education, improvement of sanitary standards—the process took slender notice of immigrant needs or desires. Believing that ‘his civilization is not his affair, but the community’s’, Anglo-Jewry—erecting his dwellings, coordinating his religion, and educating his children—sought to instil an appropriate combination of Jewishness and Englishness.⁷⁶ Anything that smacked of ‘foreignness’ or an unacceptable Jewishness was to be removed; teachers at the Jews’ Free School, for instance, forced children to change Yiddish-sounding names.⁷⁷ Many of these actions displayed antipathy toward the immigrant, whose own Jewish identity was little valued by the community.

Anglo-Jews’ understanding of their emancipated condition, as equal but responsible Englishmen, overrode their Jewish empathy. They sought primarily, therefore, not just to succour their co-religionists but to preserve their hard-won position in British society. It was imperative that, like them, the Jewish immigrants appreciated the successful formula of Diasporic Jewish existence: ‘that in accepting the hospitality of England they owe a reciprocal duty of becoming an Englishman.’⁷⁸ Informed Gentile Englishmen appreciated the community’s efforts, the sociologist Russell noting in his study of Jews in London that Anglicization lessened the ‘evil effects’ of the immigration. Having sketched how foreign Jews were ‘marked off from their neighbours by peculiar features’, he found that ‘the transformation effected by an English training is astonishing in its completeness. All the children who pass through an elementary school may be said to grow up into “English Jews”; and in this phrase there is implied a world of difference.’ Russell found remarkable not only the effect of Anglicization but also the sentiment underlying it: ‘The

frequently targeted the most vulnerable groups of immigrants: the old, the sick, and others incapable of work. Returnees might include those classified as refugees. It was hoped that the return of such people would also have a dissuasive effect, serving to prevent potential migrants from leaving.

⁷⁶ *JC*, 20 Feb. 1885, 11.

⁷⁷ R. Livshin, ‘The Acculturation of the Children of Immigrant Jews in Manchester, c.1890–1920’, in D. Cesarani (ed.), *The Making of Modern Anglo-Jewry* (Oxford, 1990), 82. The Anglo-Jewish elite so detested Yiddish that they would seldom refer to it by name, derogatorily describing it instead as ‘jargon’.

⁷⁸ *JC*, 12 Aug. 1881, 9.

English Jew, moreover, is often an ardent patriot; he is proud of being an Englishman, and seems generally to regard his foreign co-religionists from the English rather than the Jewish standpoint.⁷⁹

Not all in the community treated the immigrants' identity with such contempt and there was much debate amongst the Anglo-Jewish elite about how their integration should proceed. Whilst few defended the immigrants' identity and called for a positive campaign of acceptance, as did the Zionist sympathizer and publisher Leopold Greenberg, some did attempt to establish more of a *modus vivendi* between the community's and the immigrants' needs. These efforts were principally led by the new men of the elite, notably Samuel Montagu and Hermann Landau. Self-made and only recently married into the Cousinhood, they remained closer to the immigrants in terms of origin and religious practice than did most of the communal leadership, and this engendered a greater degree of empathy.⁸⁰ In the face of significant opposition from other communal bodies, Landau established the Poor Jews' Temporary Shelter in 1885 to provide food and board to poor transmigrants.⁸¹ Montagu, in a greater act of accommodation in 1887, created and bankrolled the Federation of Synagogues. An umbrella organization designed to unite the immigrants' makeshift religious facilities, the *hevrot* and *hadarim* that had sprung up across the East End because USyn synagogues failed to appeal to immigrant worshippers, and provide them with decent and affordable standards in a familiar environment, along with some communal representation.⁸²

⁷⁹ Russell and Lewis, *The Jew*, 6, 9, 24, 36–7. Russell's conclusions are tinged with his bias concerning modern Jewish existence and should be read in knowledge of this. Although sympathetic to British Jews, Russell believed that Jewish communities ultimately had the stark choice of remaining separate or assimilating with their host nations, and that acculturation was simply delaying the latter, which he favoured. Lewis, a Jew, attempted to counter this assumption in his essay, promoting Anglo-Jewry's emancipated compromise and defending their intra-Jewish feeling: 'Practically the English and foreign Jew feel themselves more in sympathy with each other than with the outside world.' Although Lewis was probably correct in cautioning that Russell may have been led into over-exaggerating their antagonisms by his varied Jewish witnesses, and despite his evident bias, there is still much truth in Russell's above-quoted observations.

⁸⁰ D. Gutwein, *The Divided Elite: Economics, Politics and Anglo-Jewry, 1882–1917* (London, 1992), 166.

⁸¹ Alderman, *Modern British Jewry*, 117. The JBG refused to acknowledge the Shelter as a communal institution for fifteen years because it objected to its services, which it thought would encourage immigration, in contrast to its own policies of dissuasion and repatriation.

⁸² Hochberg, 'Jewish Community', 204–8. The Federation also met with hostility from established Anglo-Jews. Despite its numerous constituents it was granted only one

However, whilst both these organizations displayed greater understanding of the immigrants' needs—and in the Federation's case respect for their identity—they were still, fundamentally, tools of Anglicization and control. The Poor Jews' Temporary Shelter replaced a self-help shelter run by an immigrant, with an austere policy of encouraging onward migration within two weeks of arrival, whereas Geoffrey Alderman has, harshly if not inaccurately, described the Federation as 'the largest single instrument of Anglicization, as well of social control, that Anglo-Jewry possessed'.⁸³ For the Federation allowed the Anglo-Jewish leadership to access and regulate immigrant religious practice within existing communal structures, thereby obviating the danger of schism and plurality. Different approaches to acculturating their immigrant brethren were pursued and hotly debated among Anglo-Jews into the twentieth century, but with few exceptions these differed in degree rather than in kind. The aim of most, although some expressed it more subtly and with greater sympathy, was to stifle the immigrants' cultural independence.

Fear of Gentile prejudice drove these efforts. Notable acts of sympathy had greeted the beginning of the migration. Russian persecution was unanimously denounced, numerous public meetings were held in protest, and a joint Gentile–Jewish-organized Mansion House Fund raised over £108,000 to aid the refugees.⁸⁴ But with the movement showing no signs of abating and ever more Jews pouring into the East End, local resentment soon manifested itself. Unfortunately for the immigrants, it was not an auspicious time to enter Britain. For much of the 1880s there was economic recession and high unemployment. The optimism of the Victorian era was giving way to pessimism, as the long-term decline in Britain's economic position began.⁸⁵ Against a background of socio-economic dislocation people were becoming uneasy about Britain's future; there was a sense of national self-doubt.⁸⁶ Besides being conspicuously foreign, the Jewish migrant was viewed as an economic competitor who overcrowded houses and trades, depressing wages and inflating rents. As Russell candidly observed: 'The invasion

seat on the Board of Deputies. In a candid letter to the *JC*, Benjamin Cohen revealed the uncompromising opinion of many of the elite toward immigrant religious practice: 'It is not so much the federation as the extinction of many of these synagogues which is to be desired.' See *JC*, 3 Aug. 1888, 6.

⁸³ Alderman, *Modern British Jewry*, 165.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.* 113.

⁸⁵ T. Endelman, 'Native Jews and Foreign Jews in London, 1870–1914', in D. Berger (ed.), *The Legacy of Jewish Migration: 1881 and its Impact* (New York, 1983), 110.

⁸⁶ Hochberg, 'Jewish Community', 12.

of the country by hordes of hungry Israelites, who seemed unfairly qualified for success in the industrial market by the combination of a sleuth-hound instinct for gain, with “an indefinitely low standard of life,” naturally stirred up a certain amount of jealous hostility among the working-classes.⁸⁷

An anti-alien lobby formed and in 1886 began organizing agitation against further immigration. This would succeed in 1905, after two decades of campaigning, in obtaining an Aliens Act from the Conservative government. Introducing the first restrictions upon free immigration to Britain for sixty-nine years and abrogating the right of asylum, the Act effectively reduced the influx.⁸⁸ Participants in the long and occasionally fierce debate concerning immigration were, for the most part, careful to avoid anti-Jewish rhetoric. However, that virtually all the immigrants were known to be Jewish made this something of a moot point. The opprobrium levelled at aliens reflected automatically onto Jews; as the *JC* came to realize: ‘Theoretically anti-alienism is not antisemitism, though there are points of contact between the two creeds, but in practice they are much of a muchness.’⁸⁹

The prospect that foreign Jews had imported anti-Semitism alongside themselves terrified Anglo-Jewry. The community was aware that prejudice against them had not ended with emancipation. The beginning of the Bulgarian Agitation saw the *JC* lament:

High-minded, benevolent and enlightened as the English people in general are, large masses among it—and this by no means always among the lowest strata—have not yet overcome the hereditary unfortunate prejudices against the Jews. They crop up but too often and not rarely in places least expected. A portion of the general press is as infected by them as some popular authors.⁹⁰

Aware of the organized and political anti-Semitism flourishing on the Continent, Anglo-Jewry feared lest the presence and impact of the Jewish immigrants transform English prejudice into a more threatening animus. N. S. Joseph warned his fellow Jews in 1886 that ‘it is not impossible that a *Judenhetze* may arise in East London from the presence of a starving population offering to work for starvation wages.’⁹¹

There was mounting evidence to suggest that racial, or at least ethnic, conceptions of Jewry were gaining currency over the 1880s in Britain. Goldwin Smith continued his critique of the community, despite the

⁸⁷ Russell and Lewis, *The Jew*, 4.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.* 136–7.

⁸⁹ *JC*, 1 May 1891, 11.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.* 21 Apr. 1876, 40.

⁹¹ *Ibid.* 26 Nov. 1886, 6.

end of the Eastern Question that had provoked it, claiming in 1881 that Jews could not be patriots: if patriotism ‘means undivided devotion to the national interest, there is difficulty in seeing how it can be possessed without abatement by the members of a cosmopolitan and wandering race, with a tribal bond, tribal aspirations, and tribal feelings of its own’.⁹² Similar ethnic assumptions were to be found at grass-roots level: both enquirers and subjects participating in the Booth Survey expressed opinions of Jews as a peculiar people, often evaluating them according to stereotyped physiognomical traits.⁹³ Anglo-Jewry perceived this change in atmosphere. Concluding a pamphlet celebrating Moses Montefiore’s 99th birthday, Dr Louis Loewe, his friend and travel companion, having recounted at length the Baronet’s achievements in combating prejudice in Europe, feared sterner efforts would soon be needed:

We are now living in an age which presents to all reflecting men a strange and most extraordinary perversion of the rights of humanity in some civilised and enlightened countries. We hear the words of peace and love falling from the lips of many a man, but there is, nevertheless, nothing but hatred in his heart and strife in all his movements. . . . we should see the pernicious effect of the hatred of races in its strongest light, so that we may endeavour, so far as lies in our power, to prevent its entering the heart of the rising generation, and where, unfortunately, it may already have taken root, remove it with all possible speed.⁹⁴

Although Anglo-Jewry was unnerved by these developments, the community remained, overall, confident of its position in England.

Not only have the attempts to excite prejudice against our poorer brethren entirely failed, but the failure has shown that the traditional, inherent love of justice and humanity among all classes of Englishmen can be trusted to prevent in England such senseless and shameless antisemitic crusades as disgraced Germany a few years ago,

the *JC* reassured in 1887.⁹⁵ This Jewish trust was not misplaced. In terms of theorizing ‘race’ and ‘nationality’ Britain lagged far behind the Continent. In Britain such conceptions of national character had to compete with other identities and loyalties: being part of a

⁹² G. Smith, ‘The Jewish Question’, *Nineteenth Century* (Oct. 1881), 495.

⁹³ Englander, ‘Booth’s Jews’, 555.

⁹⁴ Jewish Museum, Camden, MSS 199, Letters of Sir Moses Montefiore, 1869–83, Pamphlet: *The Sir Moses Montefiore Celebrations at Ramsgate on the Ninety-Ninth Anniversary of his Birthday*, 8 Nov. 1883, 14, 16.

⁹⁵ *JC*, 16 Sept. 1887, 8.

multinational federation, a multi-sectarian spiritual landscape, and a multi-ethnic empire. This inhibited the development of a restrictive sense of self in Britain.⁹⁶ There existed no organic version of the nation and nearly all politicians and intellectuals, whilst happy to promote an undefined patriotism, had little sympathy for racial conceptions or narrow definitions of nationality. Ideas of Teutonism did become popular in certain circles—the leading critic of Jewish influence during the Eastern Question, E. A. Freeman, was a notable advocate—but were never popular across Britain.⁹⁷ Increasing awareness of Jewish difference in England did not, therefore, result in popular and politicized anti-Semitism. Although the full range of classic anti-Semitic calumnies had been voiced at one time or another during the Eastern Question—Jews' control of the press, Jews' exploitation of Christian workers, Jews' economic prowess, and Jews' international conspiracy—they were never widely or systematically taken up. Most importantly, the vitriol expressed by certain sections of Liberal opinion did not translate into everyday behaviour. Anglo-Jews were associated more with 'foreignness', viewed more in categorial terms, viewed more as an 'other', but this never went further than hostility toward their cultural pluralism—the Jewish presence, *per se*, in British society was never questioned.⁹⁸

Anglo-Jewry reacted to its changing milieu. Taking their cue, as always, from shifts in Gentile opinion, English Jews also began employing ethnic and racial conceptions to describe their subculture. An unsophisticated belief in some form of Jewish nationality had continued throughout the post-emancipation decades. A residual ethnicity was ever present behind the discourse of assimilation. Reference to it remained

⁹⁶ P. Mandler, *The English National Character: The History of an Idea from Edmund Burke to Tony Blair* (London, 2006), 3.

⁹⁷ D. Lorimer, 'Race, Science and Culture: Historical Continuities and Discontinuities, 1850–1915', in S. West (ed.), *The Victorians and Race* (Aldershot, 1996), 32, and P. Mandler, 'Race and "Nation" in Mid-Victorian Thought', in S. Collini, R. Whatmore, and B. Young (eds.), *History, Religion and Culture: British Intellectual History, 1750–1950* (Cambridge, 2000), 225, 236, 240.

⁹⁸ R. Robertson, 'The Representation of the Jews in British and German Literature: A Comparison', in M. Brenner, R. Liedtke, and D. Rechter (eds.), *Two Nations: British and German Jews in Comparative Perspective* (Tübingen, 1999), 432–3, 441. Robertson also notes that Catholics were greater victims of this monocultural xenophobia. A larger minority than the Jews, with similar religious and ethnic (due to their substantial Irish contingent) disparities from English Protestants, Catholics provided a historic target for prejudice and probably served, as a result, to shield the Jewish minority from certain levels of hostility.

common in both the Christian and Jewish press; the *JC*, with surprising candour, not infrequently encouraged the matter:

Let us teach our children, then, a little more often, and a little more warmly, how great is the race whence they spring. . . Let them understand that whilst they must tender the whole strength of their patriotism to the beloved country of their birth, strive for her prosperity and aid her in her adversity; while they must proffer the full love of brotherhood to all men among whom they dwell, whatever their class or creed; still their Judaism and the spirit of their race and faith must be the master pride of their hearts!⁹⁹

There had been no option during the emancipation campaign but to downplay and refute such non-religious bonds; it was obvious, however, to both Jew and Gentile that Lionel de Rothschild's entry into the Commons had not dissolved the social dimensions of group life or severed the centuries-old association with foreign brethren.¹⁰⁰ The arrival of the immigrants, coinciding with a European move toward racial and ethnological thought, stimulated Anglo-Jewry's suppressed ethnic self-consciousness: 'we find that antisemitism which seemed such a bane has brought with it a deepening of Jewish religious feeling that has far more than counterbalanced the evil it has done. . . antisemitism has in this way proved to Judaism a blessing in disguise.'¹⁰¹

Utilizing the space around their unfixed definition within the British polity, Anglo-Jewry, gradually, subtly, and perhaps not always consciously, began reinterpreting their identity; once again, adjusting it to suit the times. Thus, increasingly over the 1880s, national and racial aspects of Jewishness were positively reincorporated into the Anglo-Jewish self-image. The *JC* began to discuss 'the historic sense of the Jews', their '*volksgeist*', in the terminology of the period.¹⁰² This was not done theoretically or with any clear-conceived notion of what constituted Jewish nationality. Like the racial ideas of the surrounding culture, Anglo-Jewry's ethnic claims suffered from conceptual confusion and often lacked strict definition.¹⁰³

One assertion was, though, universally touted: that the Jewish race and Jewish religion were inseparably bound together. Lucien Wolf, the communal journalist and foreign affairs expert, wrote in 1884: 'Judaism

⁹⁹ *JC*, 18 Sept. 1868, 4.

¹⁰⁰ Endelman, 'Making Jews', 27.

¹⁰¹ *JC*, 31 Dec. 1886, 9–10.

¹⁰² *Ibid.* 29 Sept. 1882, 10.

¹⁰³ Endelman, 'Making Jews', 28, and E. Feuchtwanger, "'Jew Feelings" and Realpolitik: Disraeli and the Making of Foreign and Imperial Policy', in T. Endelman and T. Kushner (eds.), *Disraeli's Jewishness* (London, 2002), 183.

the religion and Judaism the race are almost interchangeable terms. The rigid observance during long centuries of a “peculiar” legalism by a peculiarly exclusive people has necessarily resulted in the people becoming the manifestation of the laws,’ explaining that, as a result, ‘the Jews are as a race really superior, physically, mentally, and morally, to the people among whom they dwell’.¹⁰⁴ Judaism, the *JC* claimed, was the ‘apotheosis of chauvinism’ and, according to O. J. Simon, ‘Israel was God’s race’.¹⁰⁵ With such descriptions Anglo-Jewry revealed that it was more than simply a confession. By historically linking race and religion, it could not be understood as merely another sect; no dissenter could admit of such an ethnic faith. With this gestalt Jewishness, Jews were again, as in reality they always had been, an exceptional minority.

Not all Jews approved. There was significant internal criticism of this renewed national emphasis. In 1882 ‘A True Jew’ wrote to rebuke the *JC*:

In common with many readers I have noticed with great regret how often your correspondents, and yourself in your leading articles have lately spoken of us Jews as a nation. It is a great many centuries since we have ceased to be nation. We are a religious community, and nothing else; and just as little as you would call English Protestants or Catholics a distinct nation ought you to apply that word to us.

The letter continued to astutely expose the contradiction ethnic sentiment created in Anglo-Jewish identity:

The very writers who now so frequently use it would be indignant, and justly so, if our detractors and enemies were to deny us our English nationality, and they would be the first to proclaim that religion in no way affects nationality . . . It is by the injudicious use of words like this that we furnish handles to the Goldwin Smiths and others who maintain that we are not, and cannot be patriots.¹⁰⁶

In other words: Jews could not have their cake and eat it.¹⁰⁷ Those Anglo-Jews embracing ethnicity did not, however, consider they were. They conceived Anglo-Jewish identity as a multi-layered composite. It

¹⁰⁴ L. Wolf, ‘What is Judaism? A Question of Today’, *Fortnightly Review* (Aug. 1884), 239–40.

¹⁰⁵ *JC*, 29 Sept. 1882, 9, and O. Simon, ‘The Mission of Israel’, a sermon preached Jan. 1887, in idem, *Faith and Experience: A Selection of Essays and Addresses* (London, 1895), 178.

¹⁰⁶ *JC*, 10 Nov. 1882, 5.

¹⁰⁷ D. Cesarani, ‘British Jews’, in R. Liedtke and S. Wendehorst (eds.), *The Emancipation of Catholics, Jews and Protestants: Minorities and the Nation State in Nineteenth Century Europe* (Manchester, 1999), 53.

was not a case of stark choices between nationality or religion, British or Jewish, but a flexible compound of these sources. The balance between components could be altered, as it had been during emancipation. Promoting Jewish nationality was not, then, choosing another identity but reformulating the mixture to emphasize a different element.

The community believed there was scope for this among the polyphyletic British. As Jews had portrayed themselves as one confession among many, so they claimed to be simply another ethnic group among the many in Britain.

We have the Cymri in Wales, we have Saxons, Danes and Normans in England. We have the Scots and the Gauls in Scotland; and though composed of so many nationalities, we all live happily together in harmony . . . not interfering with each other's peculiarities of religion or race; but living together amicably and working in union for the common good.¹⁰⁸

According to Linda Colley's assessment of 'Britishness' as a superimposed umbrella identity, underneath which 'in practice, men and women often had double, triple, or even quadruple loyalties, mentally locating themselves, according to circumstances, in a village, in a particular landscape, in a region, and even in one or two countries', Anglo-Jewry may have pitched correctly.¹⁰⁹ Jews were trying to 'make the notion of "race" work for them and draw the line where its influence ceased'.¹¹⁰ And to a considerable extent they were successful. For all the community's racial ascription it remained devoted to the ideals of emancipation upon which its presence in Britain was constructed. Admittedly, the ideal had been stretched. The spacious ambiguity that had surrounded Anglo-Jewish existence and proven of such utility after emancipation was diminished and their identity invested with an even deeper ambivalence, but the foundation was unchanged. The strengthening of racial sentiment was carefully limited; Jews, above all, remained emancipated Englishmen.

They were in the main uninterested or hostile, therefore, the following decade toward the rise of political Zionism. Hermann Adler led a stringent opposition to the concept, which proved popular with some

¹⁰⁸ *JC*, 11 Dec. 1868, 4.

¹⁰⁹ L. Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707–1837* (London, 1996), 6, and idem, 'Britishness and Otherness: An Argument', *Journal of British Studies*, 31/4 (Oct. 1992), 315.

¹¹⁰ D. Feldman, *Englishmen and Jews: Social Politics and Political Culture, 1840–1914* (London, 1994), 126.

of the Jewish immigrants: 'My brethren, I view the present movement with unfeigned concern, because I regard it as opposed to the teachings of Judaism, as impolitic, aye, as charged with great peril.'¹¹¹ Although sympathetic to Jewish settlements in the Holy Land, the Anglo-Jewish upper-classes received Herzl's ideas with 'studied silence'.¹¹² To conflate Jewish nationality with citizenship of a Jewish state went far beyond British Jews' comprehension of Jewish ethnicity. In the early decades of the twentieth century this anti-Zionist attitude would become a shibboleth for the post-emancipation Cousinhood. Wrapped up with responses to Jewish immigration and the pertaining patrician leadership style, the issue of what support emancipation permitted for Jewish statehood would become the focus of debates and dissension in the community as new cadres—from the provinces, second-generation immigrants, professional and middle classes—rallied around a different interpretation in their efforts to gain greater influence over communal affairs.¹¹³

The gravitation toward racial thinking and one pole of Jewish definition was paralleled by a similar development in the opposite direction. As the currents of the age had caused some Jews to embrace their nationality, so they caused others to deracinate it, to promote a purely religious group definition. The man who intellectually inspired and would become the leading figure of this configuration of Jewish existence was Claude Goldsmid Montefiore. Coincidentally born in the year of emancipation, Claude was to be Jewish equality's most extreme exponent in Britain. In February 1902 he would co-found the Jewish Religious Union, which in 1909 would open its first synagogue and institutionalize a Liberal Judaism movement. Under Claude's direction this version of the faith offered the first Anglo-Jewish attempt to reconcile Judaism with biblical criticism, whilst also incorporating numerous reforms designed to relativize worship and bolster commitment.¹¹⁴ The Pentateuch was no longer treated as divinely inspired, the Talmud was rejected *in toto*, and, most importantly, the Return was forsaken.

To 'denationalize' the Jewish religion had been Claude's primary concern since he first began publishing his ideas in a *Contemporary*

¹¹¹ H. Adler, *Religious versus Political Zionism* (London, 1898), 7.

¹¹² S. Cohen, *English Zionists and British Jews: The Communal Politics of Anglo-Jewry, 1895–1920* (Princeton, 1982), 32.

¹¹³ *Ibid.* 47–9, 56, 106–24.

¹¹⁴ D. Langton, *Claude Montefiore: His Life and Thought* (London, 2002), 167. Examples of Liberal reforms: making head covering optional, having services no longer than seventy-five minutes, and allowing men and women to sit together.

Review article of 1882.¹¹⁵ Reacting against the growing ethnic dimension in both Gentile and Jewish thought, he believed that only the attainment of complete universality could secure a settled Jewish existence. The combination of religion and nation was a ‘doomed anachronism’; the hope of Reformers was

to bring Judaism into harmony with the religious and political opinions of themselves and the many who think like them. For, in the first place, the only point in which they believe themselves to differ from the various peoples in whose lands they live lies in their religious doctrines and rites; the original difference in ancestry and blood has no influence upon their action or their thought.¹¹⁶

Emancipating Judaism from its national heritage was the only way to complete the community’s emancipation in wider society. Therefore, Claude asserted, ‘the rise of Jewish nationalism was even more a bitter disappointment to us than the diffusion of antisemitism’.¹¹⁷ Prominent communal opinion contested this. The *JC* admired Claude’s intellectual rigour but feared his theories, ‘utterly false and impracticable’, made ‘vast concessions to the antisemites’.¹¹⁸ Samuel Montagu protested that ‘such opinions are diametrically opposed to those held almost universally by Jews, even in Western Europe’.¹¹⁹ Claude thought otherwise. Pushing the logic of emancipation to its limit, he thought assimilation in all matters save religion was the only viable future for Jewry: ‘My slogan, “Englishmen of the Jewish faith” is the solution of antisemitism and the answer to it.’¹²⁰ It was a formulation of Jewish identity located at another extremity of the post-emancipation balance. This conception also reduced the elasticity of Jewish existence but, eschewing traditional Jewish ideas, skewed the compromise, this time, in favour of British elements.

III

The world of Anglo-Jewry was changing. The community of 1887 was a different entity, facing different challenges in an altered situation,

¹¹⁵ C. Montefiore, ‘Is Judaism a Tribal Religion?’, *Contemporary Review* (Sept. 1882), 374.

¹¹⁶ *JC*, 15 Sept. 1882, 4.

¹¹⁷ E. Kessler (ed.), *An English Jew: The Life and Writing of Claude Montefiore*, 2nd edn. (London, 2002), 144.

¹¹⁸ *JC*, 1 Sept. 1882, 11, and 8 Sept. 1882, 10.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.* 22 Sept. 1882, 4.

¹²⁰ Kessler, *English Jew*, 147.

from that of thirty years earlier. Besides the revolutionary impact of the Eastern European immigrants, the minority's emancipation and integration at every level of English society had been completed with Rothschild's peerage. Meanwhile the generation that had fought for and gained equality had passed away. Moses Montefiore, so long the figurehead of Anglo-Jewry, had died in 1885. 'With his death much will doubtless die out of Judaism and great will be the changes that will now take place,' recorded Louisa de Rothschild in her diary.¹²¹ The community also experienced new directions to match these terminal points: the Sephardic community, having slumbered for most of the century, opened 'a new chapter of its history and takes a new lease of life' with the election of the controversial and energetic Dr Gaster as *Haham*, after an eight-year spell without a religious head.¹²²

These Jewish developments were paralleled by, and interrelated with, broader changes in the surrounding atmosphere that reinforced the time as a period of transition. Against a background of growing political anti-Semitism and declining liberal sentiment across Europe, British politics were changing focus. The last great democratic measure of the century, the third Reform Act, was settled in 1884 and attention had turned to the intractable constitutional problem of Ireland, which had entered a new and divisive phase with parliamentary consideration of Home Rule over 1886–7. This, in turn, had repercussions upon notions of the Union and Empire and the nature of British nationality, which came in for much public discussion at a time of economic depression and the gradual diminution of the state's international prestige. The fifty-year jubilee of Queen Victoria in 1887 saw widespread reflection alongside celebration, as Englishmen pondered their history in an attempt to grapple with contemporary challenges to their identity.¹²³ Anglo-Jews, as Englishmen, were no less caught up in this process than their Gentile countrymen but, as Jews, they admitted even more pressing reasons for reflection.

In common with Englishmen generally we remember with joyous feelings the national blessings which the last fifty years has brought in their train; but as Jews we have the additional satisfaction of recalling the benefits which have fallen

¹²¹ Cohen, *Lady de Rothschild*, 211. ¹²² *JW*, 18 Mar. 1887, 5.

¹²³ M. Ragusis, *Figures of Conversion: 'The Jewish Question' and English National Identity* (London, 1995), 12, and D. Cesarani, 'Dual Heritage or Duel of Heritages? Englishness and Jewishness in the Heritage Industry', in T. Kushner (ed.), *The Jewish Heritage in British History: Englishness and Jewishness* (London, 1992), 31.

to our lot as a community during this period. The future Jewish historian will have to describe the Victorian age as the most marvellous era in Anglo-Jewish annals. For it is impossible to imagine another space of fifty years working a revolution equally vast in condition of the Jews of this country, and more truly causing a people that walked in the darkness to see a great light.¹²⁴

As the identity of the post-emancipation years became strained and with different attitudes towards them manifesting outside the group, underlining the still unresolved basis of the Jewish presence in British society, so the community sought to remind both itself and the majority of its place. In an act of attempted self-location via self-celebration, the community organized and presented an Anglo-Jewish Exhibition at the Albert Hall in April 1887. One of the first of its type in Europe, the event was both an encomium and, as it would transpire, a eulogy to the emancipatory ideals that had dominated Anglo-Jewish life for over half a century.¹²⁵ An initial focus upon history was soon expanded to incorporate Anglo-Jewish art and Jewish religious objects, as the organizers looked to construct a heritage and present a more definitive guide to their conception of Anglo-Jewry.¹²⁶ All Jews were urged to attend: 'it is a duty of English Jews to support the Exhibition by attendance and interest. The outside world will look upon the success of the Exhibition as a test of the position of the Jews in public esteem,' cautioned the *JC*, sweetening such strictures by carrying enticingly illustrated supplements upon the exhibits.¹²⁷ Gentile participation was also encouraged. An expensive opening soir e was thrown to attract general attention; in this effort, the Council of the Exhibition believed themselves moderately successful, reporting that whilst most visitors were naturally Jews, 'a considerable number of Gentile visitors testified to the interest aroused in Jewish matters. Large numbers of Christian clergymen visited the exhibition, many on repeated occasions.'¹²⁸

There were four categories of objects exhibited: class one included pre-expulsion relics, historical records, autographs of celebrated Anglo-Jews,

¹²⁴ *JC*, 17 June 1887, 10.

¹²⁵ T. Kushner, 'Heritage and Ethnicity: An Introduction', in idem (ed.), *Jewish Heritage*, 13.

¹²⁶ Cesarani, 'Dual Heritage', 30.

¹²⁷ *JC*, 1 Apr. 1887, 12. For the supplements see 8, 15, and 22 Apr. 1887.

¹²⁸ LMA, ACC/2805/02/01/099, Office of the Chief Rabbi Records, Confidential proof report to the members of the General Council of the Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition, 28 Sept. 1887.

and details on Jews who had received honours in the British Empire; class two included portraits and prints of rabbis and representative Jewish families, as well as pictures illustrating Jewish family life; class three comprised written works upon or by English Jews; and class four contained religious artefacts, such as Passover requisites and Sabbath lamps, alongside Jewish medals, rings, and Hebrew music.¹²⁹ The picture these artefacts presented reveals much about the aspects of communal identity the Jewish elite were beginning to doubt—the elements they felt it necessary to factually promote. A disproportionate number of pre-expulsion objects, for instance, were placed upon display in an attempt to demonstrate the longevity of Jews' presence in Britain and acknowledge, in light of contemporary movements, that they were not an alien minority of recent immigration. The campaign for emancipation was also 'amply represented by the portraits of the men who bore the brunt of the fight'; reminding Jews and Gentiles of their hard-won equality of status.¹³⁰ Complementing these examples were records upon famous eighteenth- and nineteenth-century individuals, touting Anglo-Jewry's achievements and proving their ability as citizens—there was much Montefiore paraphernalia among this. The overall effect was designed to show the 'remarkable progress in the position of the community'. To this end and wary of increasing prejudice in their day, 'the Exhibition Committee wisely included a certain number of caricatures' to (hopefully) reassure the audience that 'the popular views they represented are now fortunately a phase of history that is past, and thus they form part of the history that began with vilification and is now a mark of progress'.¹³¹

The positive image of the Exhibition was, of course, far from accurate, and the Jewish press received complaints over its skewed representation. A 'Student of Anglo-Jewish History' criticized that not only were provincial Jewish experiences overlooked, areas in which Anglo-Jews could not boast notable success, such as literature or musical composition, were also ignored. Preferring a smaller, less ostentatious affair, better calculated to impart communal history, 'Student' rhetorically wondered why the organizers had so expanded their scope.

It was done to make the Exhibition *more attractive*, that is the one and only reason, and it is in this that may be found the cause that has defeated the object

¹²⁹ University of Southampton Library, MS 116/24, Small Jewish Collections, Notice for the Anglo-Jewish Exhibition, 1887.

¹³⁰ *JC*, 1 Apr. 1887, 12.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*

that some earnest workers and well-wishers have so much desired, viz., that the Exhibition should not alone induce our community to take an interest in their Anglo-Jewish history, but it would bring us the favourable appreciation of our fellow-countrymen.¹³²

These observations were true but the complaint was perhaps misguided. The Exhibition was never envisaged as a purely internal educational project. The elite organizers from the start had hoped not only to publicize information upon the minority, to demystify it, but to widely propagate evidence of a particular form of Anglo-Jewish existence. The Exhibition's primary purpose was to empirically bolster the rationale underlying the group's combined identity as English and Jewish, to convince people of its continuing validity. Elements that did not substantiate this, such as the immigrant East End, were ignored. The Exhibition was designed to elevate; as the *JC* concluded:

The Exhibition is a remarkable record of prejudice outlived by dint of honourable conduct, a record of which not only Jews may be proud, but of which England also has reason to be proud. England has to be proud of her treatment of the Jews, and Jews have to be grateful to the great country that has held up the beacon of tolerance through so many years of misrepresentation and ill-will. From this point of view the Exhibition is truly Anglo-Jewish, and in the best sense of the word, national.¹³³

The hoped for interest in Anglo-Jewish history was stimulated. The Exhibition was quickly succeeded by a published series of lectures, the launching in 1888 of the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, designed to be a medium for scholarly discussion of the minority's past and present, and the 1893 formation of a Jewish Historical Society of England. Communal history helped to reinforce Jewish pride, demonstrated the 'rootedness of Jews in English society', and, perhaps most importantly, offered an existential guide during a period of uncertainty.¹³⁴ The first essay in the post-Exhibition collection, which covered issues ranging from medieval London Jewry to the development of synagogue music and included contributions from several communal luminaries—the Chief Rabbi, *Haham*, and Lucien Wolf—was reserved for Professor H. Graetz's 'Historic Parallels in Jewish History'. Although German, the pioneering Jewish historian was accorded pride of place for a lecture that reinforced Anglo-Jewish presumptions, whilst at the same

¹³² *JC*, 22 Apr. 1887, 7. Emphasis in original.

¹³³ *Ibid.* 8 Apr. 1887, 10.

¹³⁴ Cesarani, 'Dual Heritage', 34.

time reflecting upon the loss of direction plaguing the modern Jewish experience:

if Israel is to think of realising its ideal task of bringing light to the nations it must first and above all have light within itself. . . for this it needs guidance, and this part you, more than any other community of Israel, seem called upon to fill. God has blessed you with special blessings. You dwell in a land blessed by God.¹³⁵

The first article to appear in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, also by Graetz, was tellingly entitled 'The Significance of Judaism for the Present and the Future'.¹³⁶

The holding of the Anglo-Jewish Exhibition, in the jubilee year, was the first act of an historicization process stimulated by problems of the present; a recognition of changed and changing circumstances. It therefore marks a useful, if not hard and fast, boundary between periods of Jewish conception in Britain. Although the ideals of emancipation would continue to dominate the community's identity until after the First World War, and still operate an influence over communal conceptions today, the identity reminisced over in the Exhibition, which had negotiated Anglo-Jewry through three decades of equality, had shifted. The post-emancipation existence of Anglo-Jewry had entered a new phase.

¹³⁵ H. Graetz, 'Historic Parallels in Jewish History', in *Papers Read at the Anglo-Jewish Exhibition* (London, 1888), 17.

¹³⁶ H. Graetz, 'The Significance of Judaism for the Present and the Future', in I. Abrahams and C. G. Montefiore (eds.), *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 1 (1889).

Conclusion

Post-Emancipation Anglo-Jewry

Emancipation had a huge impact upon Anglo-Jewish identity but not a conclusive one. Undertaken in an ambiguous atmosphere, the 1858 achievement of equality confirmed Jews' existence as British citizens but left the nature of their Jewish definition in doubt, and the practical combination of these two elements uncertain. Ostensibly becoming another confession among Britain's many sects, Anglo-Jews were confronted with the existential dilemma that beset all European Jews making this transition to modernity: how to balance their particularities as a minority with the universal demands of citizenship. Anglo-Jewry's response, typically unthinking and experiential, was the evolution of a unique subcultural identity.

Emancipation for tolerated British Jews was not a dramatic discontinuity, and many elements from their previous patterns of life remained existentially important in this identity. Likewise, without subsequent alterations in legal status and future change being reliant upon circumstantial adjustments, many late nineteenth-century components would continue to define the group for decades to come. Indeed, many Jews today, from historians to communal leaders, look to this period to discover the foundations of present Jewish life. Despite its antecedents and its longevity, this subculture was created in and represented a distinct phase of the Anglo-Jewish experience: the post-emancipation era, 1858–87. A time of central importance in defining the modern existence of Anglo-Jewry, it was during this period that the minority first experienced the consequences of complete inclusion and made the initial effort at living a hyphenated identity.

Like all Britons, Anglo-Jews' identity was both multi-layered and composite, combining varying types of nationality, religion, ethnicity, and citizenship. But there was a more pronounced duality, a sharper

dichotomy, in the Jew's case. His minority identity was a singularity: un-Christian; transnational; possessed of a non-European ethnicity inseparable from his religious conceptions; and operating within a culture long excluded (at least partially) from its environment. Inevitably, it would be difficult to integrate this existence with a British citizenship based upon universal principles and requirements, yet still heavily infused with Christian overtones. Many Gentile Englishmen, alongside many Jews, had remained highly sceptical regarding the possibilities of a successful merger during the emancipation campaign. But over the course of these decades the community increasingly forgot its suspicions and came to regard its emancipated definition as a success. As the minority's tutelary interference among foreign Jewish communities through the agency of the Board of Deputies and Anglo-Jewish Association reveals, Anglo-Jewry believed they had surmounted the potential problems generated by their multifaceted identity. In fact, so successful did some British Jews believe themselves that, sharing the cultural arrogance of wider society, they advanced their subculture as the model of modern Diasporic Jewish existence.

Even at the end of the post-emancipation era the Anglo-Jewish elite continued to articulate an optimistic conception of their position in Britain. So integrated were they that they identified their experiences almost completely with those of wider society, compressing their differences under British progress and fashioning a Whiggish conception of their existence. 'Here in England we have participated in all the modifications of thought and feeling which have made the England of 1887 so different from the England of 1837.'¹ Anglo-Jewry possessed a positive self-image of their modernized existence.² Reviewing the aspects of the subculture analysed in this book there seems considerable basis for such optimism. Despite an intractable pool of poverty, continually reinforced by immigration, a steady embourgeoisement continued to characterize the community's socio-economic profile post-emancipation. Social interaction with Gentiles increased apace, and with Rothschild's peerage Jews had penetrated every level of British society. In the lower tier of Parliament, the Jewish presence steadily grew. Encountering few

¹ *JC*, 17 June 1887, 6–7.

² W. Rubinstein, 'The Decline and Fall of Anglo-Jewry?', *Jewish Historical Studies*, 38 (2002), 16. As Rubinstein notes, this optimistic understanding of Anglo-Jewish identity would have been most prevalent and more often articulated among the communal elite, who benefited most from Jewish equality and English status.

problems of access, Jews comfortably integrated into the British political system, representing a variety of constituencies and interests. Careful to eschew partisan concerns, Jewish MPs were still able to obtain particular consideration from Parliament on a number of issues important to Jewry's specificity; whilst some also came to champion fundamental British principles.

Similar success was found throughout British political structures. Jewish organizations frequently cooperated with their general counterparts. This often led to the minority obtaining remarkable assistance from the state to tackle areas of Jewish concern, both at home and abroad. The Registrar General worked in close cooperation with communal authorities to regulate Jewish marriage, for instance, whilst the Home Office granted Jewish soldiers and prisoners special treatment on a number of occasions. Both the Deputies and AJA received government and often popular endorsement and assistance for many of their efforts to relieve foreign Jewish communities. Such interventions reveal a remarkable convergence of wider British and specific Jewish beliefs. Complementary and mutually esteemed ideals of disseminating progress and advancing civilization motivated both sides and demonstrate the successful blending of identities inherent to Anglo-Jewry's dual definition.

This connection could also be found within the religious domain, where there were many points of contact between British Protestantism and Anglo-Judaism. On the more rarefied of planes there was a remarkable intersection of values and self-conceptions, the Anglo-Jewish mission fitting perfectly into the Blake-esque perception many Englishmen possessed of their providential destiny. With the country around them considering itself almost a second Israel, it is not surprising that British Jews came to think of themselves as doubly blessed. Britain and Anglo-Jewry were symbionts in this sphere, complementary organisms operating in tandem to improve the world. In this respect, no other European Jewish community managed to obtain so remarkable a correlation of values with their surrounding culture and so justify their subcultural existence as did British Jews.

This was far from the entire picture, however. In everyday reality and on more prosaic levels, Anglo-Jews encountered treatment that highlighted their continuing difference and implicitly questioned their equality. Allo-Semitism, the setting apart of Jews as a people different from others and therefore requiring separate forms of understanding,

remained the normal British approach to the community.³ Essentially non-committal, allosemitism often leads to anti- or philosemitism. It can also, as happened in the post-emancipation decades, promote animosity towards the Jews as a case of heterophobia—the resentment of the different, which caused European Jews so many problems during the emancipation age.⁴ Equality had not resolved the contention of Jewry's presence in modern Britain. Many of the above achievements were made possible as much by the restriction of certain aspects of Jewishness as by the promotion of those in accordance with Englishness. Jewish MPs were exceedingly careful never to create a confessional lobby within Parliament and often ignored communal demands for certain legislation, despite such actions being commonplace among the various Christian denominations represented. Jewish activity in the public, national sphere was often undertaken in a self-limiting and paranoid manner. The Deputies' interventions abroad, subordinating foreign Jews' interests to maintenance of Foreign Office patronage, supply a prime example. The Deputies were an extreme instance, and the community was to adjust its international identity projection through the AJA, but the underlying compulsion to restrict Jewish elements non-correlative with English concerns was still present.

Often it seems the community in its unusually tolerant environment was being overcautious; but the Bulgarian Crisis demonstrated the potential for prejudice in Britain. The perceived divergence of Jewish and popular British interests, and by extension identities, over this phase of the Eastern Question saw widespread use of anti-Semitic imagery and the questioning of Anglo-Jews' patriotism—both within and without mainstream political debate. For all their integration, negative and separate associations of British Jews persisted. Post-emancipation, their combined identity was not secure enough to be beyond serious discussion.

More recent historiography has emphasized such tensions to argue that despite the considerable connections between Englishness and Jewishness at many points, the British community did not represent a particularly fortunate example of Jewish modernity. Evaluating its experience from the Jewish angle, these historians have concentrated

³ Z. Bauman, 'Allosemitism: Premodern, Modern, Postmodern', in B. Cheyette and L. Marcus (eds.), *Modernity, Culture and the 'the Jew'* (Cambridge, 1998), 143. 'Allos' is the Greek word for other.

⁴ *Ibid.* 144.

upon the loss of identity that occurred when Anglo-Jewry's modern, combined persona was forming. Considerable decline in tradition was inevitable with emancipation and this was experienced by all European Jewries. But in Britain the erosion of Jewishness went beyond the minimum necessary to adjust to modern conditions. Macaulay stated in 1833: 'The English Jews are, as far as we can see, precisely what our government has made them'; in other words, as the adage goes, England had the Jews that it deserved.⁵ The homogenizing pressure of English society and culture, whether it can be construed as exhibiting an 'antisemitism of tolerance'⁶ or not, certainly left a deep imprint upon the minority and was responsible for moulding significant elements of its identity. The *JC* fretted about the abandonment of Jewishness this occasioned in 1865:

what are we to say of those Jews whose language asserts or whose conduct implies the existence of an incompatibility between Jew and Briton, to such an extent that they appear to be of the opinion that in proportion as their Jewish characteristics become reduced their quality of Englishman becomes increased?⁷

The urge to prioritize British over Jewish identification was not merely a peripheral phenomenon post-emancipation but was conducted centrally. Englishness penetrated the legitimately Jewish sphere of religion as Judaism was Anglicized. A unique and context-restricted form of the faith was created by the community. With its reverends not rabbis, disregard for Talmudic erudition, emphasis on sermons, and English usage, Anglo-Judaism was incomprehensible to the Orthodox immigrants arriving from Eastern Europe. They preferred to worship by more traditional methods and avoided native synagogues that seemed more akin to other English religions rather than their own. The formative influence of British ideals can be detected also in Anglo-Jewish charity. For while the communal elite gave generously and accepted their responsibility to care for co-religionists, they did so increasingly via contemporary, British standards—with their class understandings, modern methods, and degradation of the poor—rather than out of traditional Jewish compunction and compassion. Unsurprisingly, in such an

⁵ I. Abrahams and S. Levy (eds.), *Macaulay on Jewish Disabilities* (Edinburgh, 1909), 29.

⁶ See B. Williams, 'The Antisemitism of Tolerance: Middle-Class Manchester and the Jews, 1870–1900', in A. Kidd and K. Roberts (eds.), *City, Class and Culture: Studies of Social Policy and Cultural Production in Victorian Manchester* (Manchester, 1985).

⁷ *JC*, 17 Mar. 1865, 4.

atmosphere inadequate provision was made for the transmission of Jewishness; Hebrew was increasingly forgotten, whilst Jewish schooling was motivated by social as opposed to religious concerns. As Todd Endelman has discovered, this meant that the Jewish commitments of acculturated families weakened with each generation. 'The balance struck by those who first entered into the life of the country failed to hold.'⁸ Like many other European Jews, the post-emancipation community in Britain developed an (increasingly) attenuated Jewish identity. Like many other Western religions, Anglo-Judaism's modernization entailed significant secularization.

The experience of modernity was not always detrimental to Jewishness in Britain, though. Positive and preserving factors also evolved. The post-emancipation age witnessed the completion of a communal structure that still provides the basic institutional framework for Jews today. At the time it provided for the most organized, non-corporate Jewry in Europe. This, in turn, was partly responsible for ensuring Anglo-Jewry remained the most coherent and compact modern community in Europe: Reform was conservative, conversions limited, and, in profession if not always in practice, the vast majority of Jews maintained an Orthodox allegiance under one hierarchy. Here, Anglo-Judaism's English emphasis upon religiosity over religion, its lax standards, and absence of learning were an advantage in maintaining a Jewish group existence in a free, individualistic society. With this environmentally contingent Jewishness that substantially mitigated the psychological trauma many Jews suffered from inhabiting two worlds, the minority suffered little loss of personnel in the immediate post-emancipation decades.

In such respects acculturation and adaptation can also be viewed as voluntary and desired. The minority detected the advantages and virtues of certain British models and adopted them as a gain to their modern definition, rather than a loss. Selective acculturation, the Jewish elite believed, was the solution to living successfully as both Jew and Englishman. It was a conclusion undoubtedly assisted by the ability of acclimatized yet professing Jews to succeed at all levels in Britain. It may have been more difficult and required greater effort than for the average Englishman, but by the mid 1880s there were many examples to emulate. Since the Resettlement, Britain, with its plural society

⁸ T. Endelman, *Radical Assimilation in English Jewish History, 1656–1945* (Bloomington, Ind., 1990), 206–7.

and political familiarity with minorities, had provided Jews with a more tolerant atmosphere, an environment more accommodating of diversity, and a more versatile society than any other European nation.

Appreciating this, the argument returns to the idea of a successful Anglo-Jewish experience. Even the normally more critically inclined Bill Williams comments that in the post-emancipation era, applying a contractualist view of Jewish equality, both sides were duly fulfilling their commitments to the bargain: toleration and acceptance in return for acculturation and loyalty.⁹ Certainly contemporaries on both sides remained sanguine about the possibilities of leading a dual existence. *The Times* of 24 Oct. 1884, observing Sir Moses Montefiore's 100th birthday, exclaimed:

Champions of his people, on whom his mantle of leadership falls, will, it is to be hoped, keep, most prominently of all his admirable virtues, before the eyes of his fellow believers his representative characteristic—the determination to show, by his life, that fervent Judaism and patriotic citizenship are absolutely consistent with one another.¹⁰

The *JC* was even more convinced in its profession of Anglo and Jewish coexistence:

In every national joy, in every national danger, in every national anxiety and national hope, we Jews of England bear our part. We are not only *in* England—we are *of* England. We are not only English Jews; we are Jewish Englishmen. It is our boast and our pleasure and pride that we can claim and fulfil the duties of Briton without sacrificing our Judaism.¹¹

The Anglo-Jewish situation had not escaped the contradiction and confusion evident in other emancipated Jewish communities. Britain proved uniquely advantageous to Jewish integration, but this came at the price of forsaking Jewish particularity not consonant with British ideals and acculturating to a point where many of the community were more connected to their Christian countrymen than foreign Jews. Exceptional opportunities mixed with banal pressures in Britain and thus, as elsewhere, there was loss and there was gain. British Jews were certainly more accepted and in their pursuit of equality more successful, as compared to many of their continental co-religionists. But their experience of modernity was far from unproblematic. There

⁹ Williams, 'Antisemitism of Tolerance', 74.

¹⁰ *The Times*, 24 Oct. 1884, 7.

¹¹ *JC*, 29 Dec. 1871, 7. Emphasis in original.

was no inevitable Whiggish path to progress, and due to its peculiar context the British experience cannot be seen as paradigmatic. Like other efforts, English emancipation also failed to establish a terminal Jewish identity or a permanent justification for the Jewish presence. Ambivalence therefore remained fundamental to modern Anglo-Jewish identity.

In many ways this was natural and to a minority could be advantageous. The experiences of Anglo-Jewry, in this respect, were not isolated ones. This book has detailed a particular period of a particular people and their history is *sui generis*. But at the same time its investigations have wider ramifications; many of the issues concerning subcultural identity, minority–majority relations, and modernization are relevant in more general contexts. The evidence of British state and society's ability to accommodate divergent groups within its civil identity, and the flexible space that possession of a universal 'Britishness' provided groups to indulge in their particular identities, for instance, are usefully applicable to other minority and immigrant histories. The theme of ambiguity that this study has highlighted, in particular, can be profitably extrapolated to better understand the general nature of minority identity and, indeed, as the isolating and fragmenting forces of modernization increasingly dissolve group definitions, the situation of the compartmentalized individual within modern society. The negative connotations of this, anomie and existential angst, have been explored by historians and sociologists,¹² but a central theme of this work has been the creative potential and advantageous possibilities of ambiguity. To the minority or immigrant, ambiguity provides the necessary space to satisfy the multiple facets of his persona and to adapt these to situational changes as required. Whilst it can generate ambivalence and insecurity over identification, it also facilitates the construction of composite subcultures and the potentially simultaneous identification of individuals within several of these, whether differentiated, for instance, by class, region, or gender. It is the positive aspects of ambiguity, providing subtlety to the unsophisticated categorization of people, which enable the peaceful existence of plural identities within the modern nation state and globalized world.

¹² See, for instance, Z. Bauman, *Liquid Modernity* (Cambridge, 2000); F. Heinemann, *Existentialism and the Modern Predicament*, 3rd edn. (London, 1958); M. Kaplan, *Alienation and Identification* (London, 1976); and D. Roberts, *Existentialism and Religious Belief* (New York, 1959).

Ambiguity was certainly a fundamental element within Anglo-Jewry's post-emancipation identity. On a positive level Jews' indeterminacy of status allowed them to continually adapt and maintain relevant integration, as the political and religious culture of Britain evolved around them. As, for instance, when they began adjusting their definitional balance to incorporate a more explicit ethnic dimension: with British culture now able to comprehend ethnic layers to identity, the community was able to revive an important facet of traditional Jewish self-definition. It was also constructive in providing the minority with a sufficiently protean existence, a necessary amorphousness, to incorporate a diverse group of individuals with a wide range of interests spanning their multiple identities—and thereby avoid the sharpness of the emancipation dilemma. This undefined identity mixture facilitated the adherence of Orthodox to nominal Jews and their collective representation, depending upon the circumstances, as a group of dissenters entitled to equality or an Anglican equivalent justified in speciality. However, this meant the hybrid subculture would always remain fluid, a liquid constantly in motion, overlapping, retreating, absorbing, as it meandered and flexed around a core that prescribed only a vague, if powerful, loyalty to both Judaism and Britain. While there was considerable space to Anglo-Jewish definition, there was very little structure. With no boundaries—outside of the strictly confessional—where Jewishness was ostensibly defensible, there was little theoretical foundation upon which to justify anything but a religious Jewishness that could never adequately encapsulate Judaism's requirements. This opened the community, who maintained ideals (if muted ones) of international and ethnic Jewishness, to criticism from all sides and left Jews susceptible to events that could divide their allegiances along English and Jewish lines. These positive and negative outcomes of ambiguity served to deepen the ambivalence inherent to the Anglo-Jewish subculture. This subculture was the result of the community's emancipation in England, of their peculiar transition to modernity. It was a genuinely combined and modern identity but one without permanent balance, where the specific formulation altered depending upon the individual and the circumstance involved. Post-emancipation, Anglo-Jewry possessed this unique version of Jewish identity.

APPENDIX 1

Jews Elected to Parliament

Date	Constituency	Candidate	Party	Result
July 1847	City of London	L. de Rothschild	L	e
	Great Yarmouth	F. H. Goldsmid	L	f
	Hythe	M. de Rothschild	L	f
	Greenwich	D. Salomons	L	f
4 July 1849	City of London	L. de Rothschild	L	e
28 June 1851	Greenwich	D. Salomons	L	e
July 1852	City of London	L. de Rothschild	L	e
	Greenwich	D. Salomons	L	f
March 1857	City of London	L. de Rothschild	L	e
28 July 1857	City of London	L. de Rothschild	L	e
The Jewish Relief Act July 1858 allows L. de Rothschild to take his seat.				
15 Feb. 1859	Hythe	M. de Rothschild	L	e
16 Feb. 1859	Greenwich	D. Salomons	L	e
April/May 1859	City of London	L. de Rothschild	L	e
	Hythe	M. de Rothschild	L	e
	Greenwich	D. Salomons	L	e
11 Jan. 1860	Reading	F. H. Goldsmid	L	e
16 July 1860	Brighton	F. D. Goldsmid	L	f
16 Feb. 1864	Brighton	J. Goldsmid	L	f
July 1865	Honiton	F. D. Goldsmid	L	e
	Reading	F. H. Goldsmid	L	e
	City of London	L. de Rothschild	L	e
	Hythe	M. de Rothschild	L	e
	Aylesbury	N. de Rothschild	L	e
	Greenwich	D. Salomons	L	e
	28 Mar. 1866	Honiton	J. Goldsmid	L
November 1868	Reading	F. H. Goldsmid	L	e
	Surrey Mid	J. Goldsmid	L	f
	Dover	G. Jessel	L	e
	City of London	L. de Rothschild	L	f

Date	Constituency	Candidate	Party	Result
	Hythe	M. de Rothschild	L	e
	Aylesbury	N. de Rothschild	L	e
	Greenwich	D. Salomons	L	e
	Dewsbury	J. Simon	L	e
	Sandwich	H. de Worms	C	f
22 Feb. 1869	City of London	L. de Rothschild	L	e
19 July 1870	Rochester	J. Goldsmid	L	e
25 Nov. 1871	Dover	G. Jessel	L	e
February 1874	Lewes	A. Cohen	L	f
	Reading	F. H. Goldsmid	L	e
	Rochester	J. Goldsmid	L	e
	Nottingham	S. Isaac	C	e
	City of London	L. de Rothschild	L	f
	Aylesbury	N. de Rothschild	L	e
	Dewsbury	J. Simon	L	e
April 1880	Southwark	A. Cohen	L	e
	Rochester	J. Goldsmid	L	f
	Nottingham	S. Isaac	C	f
	Aylesbury	N. de Rothschild	L	e
	Dewsbury	J. Simon	L	e
	Pontefract	Sidney Woolf	L	e
	Greenwich	H. de Worms	C	e
18 May 1880	Sandwich	J. Goldsmid	L	f
17 July 1885	Aylesbury	F. de Rothschild	L	e
November 1885	Southwark West	A. Cohen	L	e
	Paddington North	L. L. Cohen	C	e
	St Pancras South	J. Goldsmid	L	e
	Finsbury Central	S. Isaac	C	f
	Walworth	L. Isaacs	C	e
	Derbyshire Mid	J. Jacoby	L	e
	Whitechapel	S. Montagu	L	e
	Aylesbury	F. de Rothschild	L	e
	Dewsbury	J. Simon	L	e
	Toxteth East	H. de Worms	C	e
July 1886	Southwark West	A. Cohen	L	e
	Paddington North	L. Cohen	C	e
	St Pancras South	J. Goldsmid	LU	e
	Walworth	L. Isaacs	C	e

Date	Constituency	Candidate	Party	Result
	Derbyshire Mid	J. Jacoby	L	e
	Whitechapel	S. Montagu	L	e
	Aylesbury	F. de Rothschild	LU	e
	Dewsbury	J. Simon	L	e
	Toxteth East	H. de Worms	C	e

Notes: e = elected; f = failed to be elected; L = Liberal; LU = Liberal Unionist; C = Conservative.

Source: Information taken from M. Jolles, *Directory of Distinguished British Jews* (London, 2002), 95–9.

APPENDIX 2

Synagogue Statistics at the Board of Deputies

Board Triennial Session	1859–62	1862–5	1865–8	1868–71	1871–4	1874–7	1877–80	1880–3	1883–6	1886–9
Number of deputies in period (not including replacements)	25	27	23	30	39	39	40	38	47	50
Of which, represented provincial synagogues	9	11	7	13	19	18	18	12	20	21
As percentage	36	40.7	30.5	43.3	48.7	46.2	45	31.6	42.6	42
Number of synagogues represented	15	17	13	19	28	26	27	27	33	33
Of which, were provincial	9	11	7	12	19	16	16	13	19	18
As percentage	60	64.7	53.8	63.2	67.9	61.5	59.3	48.1	57.6	54.5
Number of synagogues with Board marriage licence	43	43	44	49	54	56	58	60	59	59
Synaogues on Board as percentage of this	34.9	39.5	29.5	38.8	51.9	46.4	46.6	45	55.9	55.9

Source: Information taken from the Minute Books of the Board of Deputies.

APPENDIX 3

Post-Emancipation Deputies and their Attendance

Member	Synagogue represented	Member of LPC	Member of CFC	1859–62	1862–5	1865–8	1868–71	1871–4	1874–7	1877–80	1880–3	1883–6	1886– Dec 1887	Average attendance per session
Abraham, Samuel V.	Western								14	16	11	10	6	12.8
Abrahams, L. B.	Bayswater											(res. Aug. 1883) 1		1
Abrahams, Israel	Cardiff							(1873) 7	20	11	6	3		9.4
Adler, Marcus N.	Bayswater	Yes (1874)						24	22					23
Alexander, David Lindo	Central	Yes (1877)	Yes (1880)							23	18	21	4	20.7
Barnett, Barney	Hull											6	4	6
Barnett, P.	Liverpool (New)											1		1
Benjamin, M. H.	Sheffield							(1873) 6	12					9
Bernstein, W. F.	Manchester (South)												1	–
Birnbaum, Bernard	North London								16	11	5	6	5	9.5

Member	Synagogue represented	Member of LPC	Member of CFC	1859-62	1862-5	1865-8	1868-71	1871-4	1874-7	1877-80	1880-3	1883-6	1886- Dec 1887	Average attendance per session
Brandon, Gabriel S.	Spanish and Portuguese											6	3	6
Castello, Manuel	Spanish and Portuguese	Yes (1868)	Yes (1883)				23	22	16	12	10	19	7	17
Clifford, Maurice	Coventry/Leeds (1886)										(Nov. 1882) 5	18	5	11.5
Cohen, Arthur	Edinburgh/Central (1880)	Yes (1869)	Yes				(Aug. 1869) 5	3	6	4	8	6	3	5.3
Cohen, Benjamin, L.	Bayswater											(Nov. 1883) 12	5	12
Cohen, John A.	Borough (New)											7	3	7
Cohen, Joseph F.	Newcastle (Old)/Dalston (1880)								18	12	9	6		11.3
Cohen, Louis	Great	Yes		22	13	18	17	22	9					16.8
Colaco, B.	Spanish and Portuguese								16	16				16
D'Avigdor, E.	Leeds									(1878 res. 1879) 2				2
Davis, A.	Leeds									(res. 1878) 1				1
Davis, Benn	St John's Wood									5	0	1	3	2
Davis, E. F.	Canterbury										(res. Apr. 1882) 0		0	0
Davis, Ernest Henry	Dover												4	-
Davis, Frederic	Central										6	2	4	4

Member	Synagogue represented	Member of LPC	Member of CFC	1859-62	1862-5	1865-8	1868-71	1871-4	1874-7	1877-80	1880-3	1883-6	1886- Dec 1887	Average attendance per session
Guedalla, Haim	Canterbury			9	8	9								13
Haldenstein, H. H.	Norwich												5	-
Halford, Frederick B.	Hull	Yes (1877)								12				12
Harris, Alfred W. (Ald.)	Dublin											3		3
Harris, Henry	Maiden Lane	Yes	Yes	26	23	31	29	26	32	26	25	21	10	26.6
Harris, Henry S.	Canterbury/Southampton (1880)								25	15	8			16
Harris, Samuel.	Merthyr Tydvil								(res. 1876) 15					15
Hart, A. H.	Edinburgh		(ret. 1861)	12										12
Hart, Israel	Canterbury							7						7
Heilbut, Samuel	Bayswater											6	2	6
Henriques, Alfred G.	Portsea/Merthyr Tydvil (1886)	Yes (1872)						11					(res. Nov. 1886) 0	11
Henriques, Cecil Q.	Newcastle-on-Tyne											(res. Feb. 1885) 4		4
Henry, Michael	Sheffield							(res. 1872) 8						8
Hoffnung, Abraham	Liverpool (Old)	Yes (1877)								12	5	2	(res. June 1887) 0	6.3
Hyams, Louis	Nottingham										17	(res. July 1885) 21		19
Hymans H.	East London										1			1

Member	Synagogue represented	Member of LPC	Member of CFC	1859-62	1862-5	1865-8	1868-71	1871-4	1874-7	1877-80	1880-3	1883-6	1886-	Average attendance
													Dec 1887	per session
Isaac, Saul	Dublin/Dover (1865)			22	10	10	8	1						10.2
Isaacs, Henry A.	Hambro					6	6	7						6.3
Isaacs, Joseph M.	Hambro							(1872) 5						5
Isaacs, Samuel	Liverpool (New)			3	(res. 1863) 1									2
Israel, Henry A.	Hambro								12	10	14			12
Jacobs, David L.	Hull/Borough (New) (1874)							11	10					10.5
Jacobs, J. I.	Chatham												4	-
Jacobs, S.	Hambro											7	8	7
Jaffe, M.	Newport (Monmouth)									7	8	4		6.3
Jonas, Jonah	Canterbury										(Apr. 1882) 0	0		0
Joseph, M. S.	Wolverhampton/Borough(New) (1877)						15	19		12	10			14
Keeling, Henry L.	Western			(July 1863) 11	17	21		19						17
Keyzar, Abraham	West Hartlepool							(d. 1873) 11						11
Kisch, Henry	Leeds											(res. June 1884) 2		2

Member	Synagogue represented	Member of LPC	Member of CFC	1859-62	1862-5	1865-8	1868-71	1871-4	1874-7	1877-80	1880-3	1883-6	1886- Dec 1887	Average attendance per session
Kisch, S. A.	Swansea				7									7
Lazerus, I.	Exeter									(res. 1877) 2				2
Lazerus, Joseph	Great							(d. 1873) 2						2
Levy, A.	East London										17	7	1	12
Levy, Hyam	Central									(Feb. 1879) 2	1			1.5
Levy, L.	East London											8	2	8
Lewis, Isaac	Sheffield										0			0
Lewis, Lewis	Brighton										2	2	3	2
Lindo, Gabriel	Cheltenham/ Spanish, etc (1880)	Yes (1877)	Yes					10	9	11	15	8	5	10.6
Lyons, J.	Chatham											6		6
Magnus, Philip	West London												4	-
Marks, I. M.	Great										3	2		2.5
Mason, Jules	Leeds											(June 1884) 11	(res. May 1887) 6	11
Mendelssohn, H. S.	Newcastle-on-Tyne												9	-
Meyers, Barnett	Glasgow							(res. 1873) 3						3
Mocatta, A.	Spanish and Portuguese								22	18				9
Montagu, Samuel	Manchester (Old)/New West End(1880)	Yes (1880)					(Mar. 1869) 14	14	15	9	12	17	3	13.5

Member	Synagogue represented	Member of LPC	Member of CFC	1859-62	1862-5	1865-8	1868-71	1871-4	1874-7	1877-80	1880-3	1883-6	1886- Dec 1887	Average attendance per session
Montefiore, A. J.	Spanish and Portuguese										12			12
Montefiore, Joseph M.	Spanish and Portuguese	Yes	Yes	12	25	27	27	29	32	28	(d. Oct. 1880) 3			22.9
Montefiore, Moses	Spanish and Portuguese	Yes		24	0	4	2	0	(Honorary) 0	(Honorary) 0				6
Montefiore, Nathaniel	Spanish and Portuguese										(d. Apr. 1883) 0			0
Mosely, Charles	Liverpool (Old)			0	0	0								0
Mosely, Ephraim	Newcastle-on-Tyne				4									4
Moses, Samuel	Great/Central (1871)	Yes		24	12	14	15	13	9					14.5
Myer, H. H.	Cheltenham											15		15
Nathan, Henry	Birmingham									4	12	9	3	8.3
Nathan, Louis	Great/Central (1871)			13	4	8	8	7	2	2				6.3
Nelson, Bernard	Liverpool (New)				(Oct. 1863) 1									1
Newgrass, B.	Liverpool (Old)												(June 1887) 1	-
Oppenheim, Morris	Manchester (Old)/Bayswater (1877)	Yes (1869)	Yes				(Mar. 1869) 16	21	19	21	(d. Jan. 1883) 16			18.6
Ososki, Louis	New												1	-
Phillips, B. S.	Great/Central (1871)	Yes		11	0	1	3	4	0	0				2.7

Member	Synagogue represented	Member of LPC	Member of CFC	1859-62	1862-5	1865-8	1868-71	1871-4	1874-7	1877-80	1880-3	1883-6	1886-	Average attendance
													Dec 1887	per session
Phillips, Jacob	Birmingham			0	0	0	0	2	0					0.3
Picciotto, Moses H.	Spanish and Portuguese	Yes (1860)		17	23	20	7	10						15.4
Pick, Ignace	Hambro/Great (1880)								12	(res. 1879) 4	4	4		6
Polack, Joseph	Dover											6		6
Pool, Marcus	Great								7	6				6.5
Rosenthal, John D.	Dublin					3	0	3	0	4	1		1	1.8
Rosenthal, Lionel H.	Canterbury												2	-
Rothschild, L. M.	Edinburgh/Leeds (1871)			(Oct. 1861) 3	17	11	(res. 1869) 1	10						8.4
Rothschild, Leopold de	Great										0	0	0	0
Rothschild, Lionel de	Great	Yes		0	0	0	0	0	0	(d. 1879) 0				0
Salomon, A.	Hambro											3	2	3
Salomons, David L.	Newcastle (New)								1					1
Salomons, Philip Samuel, B. (Barnett)	New Coventry			0	0	(d. 1867) 0				20	(d. July 1882) 11			0 15.5

Member	Synagogue represented	Member of LPC	Member of CFC	1859-62	1862-5	1865-8	1868-71	1871-4	1874-7	1877-80	1880-3	1883-6	1886- Dec 1887	Average attendance per session
Samuel, Edwin Lewis	Liverpool (Old)							15	5					10
Samuel, Ralph Henry	Liverpool (Old)						0							0
Samuel, Stuart M.	Sheffield												3	-
Sassoon, Reuban D.	Coventry						(Sept. 1870) 3	0						1.5
Schloss, Solomon	New	Yes (1874)				(1867) 8	26	24	28	23	24	23		22.3
Sebag (-Montefiore), J	Spanish and Portuguese	Yes (1861)	Yes	22	16	14	16	24	23	13	22	31	11	20.1
Simon, Oswald J.	Sunderland												7	-
Simons, Simon	Great/Dalston (1886)									3			1	3
Slazenger, R.	Merthyr Tydvil												1	-
Solomon, Henry	New		Yes	25	17	25	25	21	25	13	19	24		21.6
Solomon, J. J.	Chatham	Yes (1868)		24	14	13	24							18.8
Solomon, J. W.	Western			16	(d. 1863) 4									10
Solomon, John I.	Chatham	Yes (1871)						25	21	13				19.6
Solomon, Joseph, M.	Newport (Monmouth)	Yes (1871)					(Aug. 1869) 12		6					9

Member	Synagogue represented	Member of LPC	Member of CFC	1859–62	1862–5	1865–8	1868–71	1871–4	1874–7	1877–80	1880–3	1883–6	1886– Dec 1887	Average attendance per session
Solomon, Judah	Plymouth				11									11
Solomon, Saul	Borough (New)						21	16						18.5
Spyer, Solomon	St John's Wood												6	–
Van Praagh, Moses	Hambro	Yes		24	11	16	16	(d. 1872)	1					13.6
Van Stanveren, B. J.	Great												1	–
Woolf, David	Glasgow						(Sept. 1870)	2						2
Woolf, Saul	New												1	–

Notes: d. = died; res. = resigned; ret. = retired. A date entered in a cell indicates the time when one of these events occurred or when the Deputy joined that session.

The 1886–7 column has not been included in the tabulations for average attendance per session, as the figures do not represent a full session, and have only been included for comparative purposes. Deputies that began their Board career after 1886 thus have no career average.

Source: Information taken from the Minute Books of the Board of Deputies.

Glossary

Unless otherwise indicated the following terms are translated from Hebrew or Yiddish.

Aberglaube (German) superstition

Beth Din Jewish ecclesiastical court

B'nai B'rith (lit. Children of the Covenant) an international Jewish philanthropic fraternity

dayan (pl. *dayanim*) judge, member of the *Beth Din*

hadarim (s. *heder*) makeshift, unregulated religious-instruction classes, usually held in a room of the teacher's house

Haham (lit. wise one) the rabbinic head of the London Sephardi community

Haskalah the Jewish Enlightenment

hazzan (alt. *chasonos*) a cantor-like religious official

herem a ban designed to isolate non-conforming individuals from the community

hevrot (s. *hevrach*) society or fellowship

Judenhetze (German, lit. Jew-hunt) pogrom

Kehilla (pl. *Kehillot*) self-governing community of Jews

Landesrabbinat (German) state rabbinate appointed by many German states from the seventeenth century onwards to fulfil civic, representational, and religious functions

Mahamad the council of a Western Sephardi community

Milah circumcision

Shechita ordinances relating to the ritual slaughter of animals according to Orthodox Jewish law

shtiebel small, informal congregation that meets in a private residence

trefpa (alt. *trefa*) not kosher food and therefore forbidden

tzedakah Old Testament term which is taken in modern terminology to mean welfare or social service, generally giving to the needy as an act of duty

Wissenschaft des Judentums (German) the Science of Judaism, a term used to describe the scholarly study of Judaism

Yehidim male synagogue members

Yeshiva (pl. *Yeshivot*) academy for the study of the Law

yudekeend (lit.) Jewish child

Bibliography

MANUSCRIPTS, PAPERS, AND RECORDS

- Aberdeen Papers, MS 43,244, British Library.
- Anglo-Jewish Association, Papers, MS 137, University of Southampton Library.
- Board of Deputies of British Jews, Records, ACC/3121, London Metropolitan Archives.
- Churchill, Lord Randolph, Papers, Add. MS 9248, Cambridge University Library.
- Church's Ministry among the Jews, Papers, Dep. C.M.J. c.61–e.33, Bodleian Library, University of Oxford.
- Confidential Memorandum Relative to the Grant of British Protection to Foreign Jews in Palestine, 2 Feb. 1884, Foreign Office, FO 881/4907, National Archives.
- Conservative Election Ephemera, Southwark Local History Library.
- Converts to Judaism, Papers Relating to, MS 301, University of Southampton Library.
- Dilke, Sir Charles Wentworth, Second Bt., Papers, MS 43875–43922, British Library.
- Escott, T. H. S., Papers, Add. MSS 58774–58796, British Library.
- Foreign Office Correspondence about the Jew Boy, Mortara, 1858, FO881/811, National Archives.
- Foreign Office Correspondence on Turkey: Protection of the Jews in Syria, 1871–4, FO78/2375A, National Archives.
- Gaster, M., Papers, EJ:2–EJ:12 and Jew.Cultural-Religious, UCL Special Collections.
- Gibbs, Robert of Aylesbury, Papers, D15/4/1–2, Centre for Buckinghamshire Studies.
- Gladstone, William Ewart, Papers of the Prime Ministers of Great Britain Microfilm, Series Eight (Primary Source Media Ltd. 1997), Add. MSS 44352–44526, Bodleian Library, University of Oxford.
- Goldberg, P., Papers relating to the United Synagogue, MS 148/2, University of Southampton Library.
- Goldsmid Letterbooks, vols. 1–2, Mocatta MSS 22 (1–2), UCL Special Collections.
- Harcourt, Sir William, Papers, MS Harcourt dep 208, Bodleian Library, University of Oxford.
- Hartog, N., Papers, MS 70, Jewish Museum, Camden.

- Hughenden Papers: Papers Relating to Benjamin Disraeli (Earl of Beaconsfield) and his Family, Dep. Hughendon 141/3, Bodleian Library, University of Oxford.
- Jewish Board of Guardians, Records, in Archives of Jewish Care, MS 173, University of Southampton Library.
- Jewish Religious Education Board, Papers, MS 157, University of Southampton Library.
- Jews' College, Reports, LMA/4180 London Metropolitan Archives.
- Jews' Free School, Correspondence, LMA/4046, London Metropolitan Archives.
- Jews' Free School, Reports, MS 153, University of Southampton Library.
- Jews' Hospital and Orphan Asylum Amalgamation Scheme, 7 July 1876, MS 127, University of Southampton Library.
- London Beth Din, Records, ACC/3400, London Metropolitan Archives.
- Marriages: Report of the Board of Deputies on Jewish Marriages to the Home Office, 11 Dec. 1868, HO45/8161, National Archives.
- Montefiore, Sir Moses, Letters, 1869–83, MS 199, Jewish Museum, Camden.
- Montefiore, Sir Moses, Papers: Copies, Transcripts and Translations of Correspondence and Papers to and from Sir Moses Montefiore, or on his Behalf, 1793–1885, MS 259, University of Southampton Library.
- Montefiore Family Papers, UCL Special Collections.
- Office of the Chief Rabbi, Papers, ACC/2805, London Metropolitan Archives.
- Peel Papers, MSS 40,540, 40,560, 40,567, 40,594, British Library.
- Rothschild, Baron Lionel de, Papers and Correspondence, 000/13, 000/848, 000/924/4, Rothschild Archive, London.
- Rothschild Family, Letters, 1863–1925, MS 43, University of Southampton Library.
- Rothschild Family, Papers and Correspondence, RFAM C/3, C/4, XI/109/95, 000/84, 000/235, 000/573/6, Rothschild Archive, London.
- Russell, Lord John, Papers, PRO 30/22, National Archives.
- Russell, Odo, Papers and Correspondence, 1851–84, FO918, National Archives.
- Small Jewish collections, MS 116, University of Southampton Library.
- Smith, John Abel, Papers, West Sussex Record Office.
- Spanish and Portuguese Jews Records: MSS 113–16, Spanish and Portuguese Jews' Congregation.
- Swaythling, Lord, Papers, MS 117, University of Southampton Library.
- United Synagogue, Records: ACC/2712, London Metropolitan Archives.
- Waley Family, Papers, MS 118, University of Southampton Library.
- West London Synagogue of British Jews, Records, MS 140, University of Southampton Library.

PARLIAMENTARY RECORDS

- Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Third Series.
- Parliamentary Papers 1861, xxi: Report of the Commissioners Appointed to Inquire into the State of Popular Education in England.
- Parliamentary Papers 1867, xxxvii: Correspondence Respecting the Condition of the Jews in Servia.
- Parliamentary Papers 1867, lxxiv: Correspondence Respecting the Persecution of the Jews in Moldavia.
- Parliamentary Papers 1867, lxxiv: Further Correspondence Respecting the Persecution of the Jews in Moldavia.
- Parliamentary Papers 1877, xli: Correspondence Respecting the Condition and Treatment of the Jews in Servia and Romania, 1867–1876.
- Parliamentary Papers 1877, xliii: Turkey No. 2 Correspondence Respecting the Conference at Constantinople and the Affairs of Turkey.
- Parliamentary Accounts and Papers 1878, xxxvi: Turkey No. 1 Further Correspondence Respecting the Affairs of Turkey.
- Parliamentary Papers 1880, xl: Correspondence held at Madrid in 1880 Respecting the Right of Protection of Moorish Subjects by the Diplomatic and Consular Representatives of Foreign Powers in Morocco.
- Parliamentary Reports from Commissioners 1867–8, xxxii: Report of the Royal Commission on the Laws of Marriage.
- Parliamentary Reports from Commissioners 1876, xxix: Report of the Commissioners Appointed to Inquire into the Working of the Factory and Workshop Acts, with a View to their Consolidation and Amendment; Together with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index.
- Parliamentary Reports from Commissioners 1903, ix: Report of the Royal Commission on Alien Immigration.

NEWSPAPERS AND JOURNALS

- Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*
- British Weekly: A Journal of Social and Christian Progress*
- Bucks Advertiser and Aylesbury News*
- Contemporary Review*
- Daily Telegraph*
- Derby Daily Telegraph*
- Derby Reporter*
- Derbyshire Advertiser and Journal*
- Dewsbury Chronicle*

Fortnightly Review
Greenwich and Deptford Chronicle
Jewish Chronicle
Jewish Quarterly Review
Jewish World
Kentish Independent
Kentish Mercury
Liverpool Courier
Liverpool Daily Albion
Liverpool Daily Post
Macmillan's Magazine
Morning Chronicle
Nineteenth Century
Nottinghamshire Guardian
Paddington Times
Pictorial World
Pontefract Telegraph
Reading Mercury
Rochester and Chatham Journal and Mid-Kent Advertiser
Saturday Review
Southwark Standard and South London News
Spectator
The Times
Voice of Jacob

PRINTED PRIMARY SOURCES

- Abrahams, I., and Levy, S. (eds.), *Macaulay on Jewish Disabilities* (Edinburgh, 1909).
- Adler, H., *The Jews in England* (London, 1870).
- *The Purpose and Methods of Charitable Relief: Two Sermons Preached at the Bayswater Synagogue* (London, 1884).
- *'Remember the Poor': A Sermon Preached in Memory of the Late Baroness Lionel de Rothschild at the Central Synagogue* (London, 1884).
- *Hebrew the Language of our Prayers* (London, 1885).
- *The Industrious Apprentice* (London, 1887).
- *The Ideal Jewish Pastor* (London, 1891).
- *The Functions of the Jewish Pulpit* (London, 1892).
- *Religious versus Political Zionism* (London, 1898).
- Adler, N., *Sermon Delivered at the Great Synagogue on the Occasion of His Installation into Office as Chief Rabbi of Great Britain* (London, 1845).
- *The Jewish Faith* (London, 1848).

- Anderson, D., *'For Mordecai was a Jew': Jewish Emancipation. A Voice from Israel* (London, 1857).
- Angel, M., *The Law of Sinai and its Appointed Times* (London, 1858).
- Artom, B., *Sermons* (London, 1873).
- The Authorised Daily Prayer Book of the United Hebrew Congregations of the British Empire: With a New Translation by Rev. S. Singer* (London, 1890).
- Ben Israel, M., 'To his Highness the Lord Protector of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland: The Humble Addresses of Menassah Ben Israel, a Divine and Doctor of Physic, in Behalf of the Jewish Nation' (1656), in P. Radin (ed.), *Pamphlets Relating to the Jews in England during the 17th and 18th Centuries* (San Francisco, 1939).
- Benisch, A., *Judaism Surveyed: Being a Sketch of the Rise and Development of Judaism from Moses to our Days* (London, 1874).
- Boyle, A., *The Sympathy and Action of England in the Late Eastern Crisis and What Came of Them: Also the Value of the Rhodope Report* (London, 1878).
- Cohen, L. (ed.), *The Journal of Lady de Rothschild, 1837–1854 and 1867–1906* (London, 1932).
- Collier, T., 'A Brief Answer to Some of the Objections and Demurs Made against the Coming in and Inhabiting of the Jews in this Commonwealth' (1656), in P. Radin (ed.), *Pamphlets Relating to the Jews in England during the 17th and 18th Centuries* (San Francisco, 1939).
- The Conversion of the Jews* (Apr. 1888).
- A Country Vicar, *Jewish Emancipation a Christian Duty* (London, 1853).
- De Worms, H., *England's Policy in the East* (London, 1877).
- Disraeli, B., *Lord George Bentinck: A Political Biography* (London, 1905).
- Emanuel, C., *A Century and a Half of Jewish History: Extracted from the Minute Books of the London Committee of the Deputies of the British Jews* (London, 1910).
- Epistle from a High Priest of the Jews to the Chief Priest of Canterbury, on the Extension of Catholic Emancipation to the Jews*, 2nd edn. (London, 1821).
- A Few Words on Jewish Congregational Union by a Victim of Jewish Congregational Disunion* (London, 1868).
- A Foreign Resident [T. H. S. Escott], *Society in London* (London, 1885).
- Freeman, E. A., *The Ottoman Power in Europe: Its Nature, its Growth, and its Decline* (London, 1877).
- French National Assembly, 'Debate on the Eligibility of Jews for Citizenship', 23 Dec. 1789, in P. Mendes-Flohr and J. Reinharz (eds.), *The Jew in the Modern World: A Documentary History*, 2nd edn. (Oxford, 1995).
- Future Probation: A Symposium on the Question 'Is Salvation Possible after Death?'* (London, c.1886).
- Gawler, G., *The Emancipation of the Jews Indispensable for the Maintenance of the Protestant Profession of the Empire; and, in Other Respects, Most Entitled to the Support of the British Nation* (London, 1847).

- Gibbs, R., *A History of Aylesbury with its Borough and Hundreds, the Hamlet of Watton, and the Electoral Division* (Aylesbury, 1885).
- Goldsmid, F. H., *Remarks on the Civil Disabilities of British Jews* (London, 1830).
- Graetz, H., 'Historic Parallels in Jewish History', in *Papers Read at the Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition* (London, 1888).
- H.H.J., *Breakers Ahead! or The Doomed Ship, the Determined Captain, and the Docile Crew: A Review of Lord Beaconsfield's Policy* (London, 1878).
- Hirschel, S., *Address Delivered on Laying the Foundation Stone of the Intended New Synagogue*, 10 May 5597 (London).
- H.N., *Little Miriam's Holyday Stories for Little Jewish Readers* (London, 1868).
- Home and Foreign Policy of the Conservative Government: Three Speeches Delivered by Baron Henry de Worms to the Electors of Greenwich* (London, 1880).
- How we Spoil our Holiday or, All is Not Well that Ends Well: A Story for Jewish Schoolboys* (London, 1868).
- Hurwitz, H., *A Letter to Isaac L. Goldsmid, Chairmen of the Association for Obtaining for British Jews Civil Rights and Privileges on Certain Recent Misstatements Respecting the Jewish Religion* (London, 1833).
- Jacobs, J., *Studies in Jewish Statistics, Social, Vital and Anthropometric* (London, 1891).
- Jewish Emancipation by an Israelite* (London, 1845).
- Kebbel, T. (ed.), *Selected Speeches of the Late Right Hon. the Earl of Beaconsfield*, 2 vols. (London, 1882).
- Kellogg, S., *The Jews or Prediction and Fulfilment an Argument for the Time*, 2nd edn. (London, 1887).
- Letters of Britannicus, *The Case of Mr. Salomons, Alderman Elect of the Ward of Aldgate* (London, 1836).
- Loewe, L. (ed.), *Diaries of Sir Moses and Lady Montefiore*, 2 vols. (London, 1890).
- Löwy, A., and Marks, D., *A Memoir of Sir Francis Henry Goldsmid* (London, 1879).
- *A Memoir of Sir Francis Henry Goldsmid*, 2nd edn. rev. and enlarged (London, 1882).
- Margoliouth, M., *The History of the Jews in Great Britain*, 3 vols. (London, 1851).
- Marks, D., *The Law is Light: A Course of Four Lectures on the Sufficiency of the Law of Moses as the Guide of Israel* (London, 1854).
- *Sermons Preached at Various Occasions at the West London Synagogue of British Jews* (London, 1885).
- Mills, J., *The British Jews* (London, 1853).
- Montagu, B., *A Letter to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Chichester upon the Emancipation of the Jews* (London, 1834).
- Myers, A., *The Jew*, 6th edn. (London, 1874).
- Nieto, D., *The Rod of Judgement, Being a Supplement to the Book Kuzari, which demonstrates by natural inferences the Truth of the Oral Law transmitted to us*

- by the sages of Israel the authors of the Mishna and the Talmud*, trans. L. Loewe (London, 1842).
- Peace or War! An Indictment of the Policy of the Government* (London, 1879).
- Phoenix, *Scriptural Reasonings in Support of the Jewish Claims to Sit in the Commons House of Parliament Addressed to the Conscience of the Christian People of the British Empire* (London, 1850).
- Picciotto, J., *Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History* (London, 1875).
- 'Report to the Members of the General Committee of the Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition', in *Papers Read at the Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition* (London, 1888).
- Russell, C., and Lewis, H., *The Jew in London: A Study of Racial Character and Present-Day Conditions* (London, 1900).
- Salaman, C., *Jews as They Are*, 2nd edn. (London, 1885).
- Salomons, D., *A Short Statement on Behalf of His Majesty's Subjects Professing the Jewish Religion* (London, 1835).
- *The Case of David Salomons, Esq., Being his Address to the Court of Aldermen on Applying for Admission as Alderman of the Ward of Portsoken* (London, 1844).
- *Alteration of Oaths Considered in a Letter to the Earl of Derby* (London, 1853).
- *Notes on the History of the Oaths of Allegiance, Supremacy, and Abjuration* (London, 1857).
- Salomons, the Friend of the People*, 1859 election song, Greenwich Heritage Centre.
- Schiller-Szinessy, S., *An Exposition of Isaiah lii 13 14 15 and liii* (1882).
- Singer, S., 'Judaism and Citizenship' (1894), in *The Literary Remains of the Rev. Simeon Singer: Sermons*, selected and edited with a memoir by Israel Abrahams (London, 1908).
- 'The Return of the Jews to an Agricultural Life' (1889), in *The Literary Remains of the Rev. Simeon Singer: Sermons*, selected and edited with a memoir by Israel Abrahams (London, 1908).
- 'Jews in their Relation to Other Races' (1890), in *The Literary Remains of the Rev. Simeon Singer: Lectures and Addresses*, selected and edited by Israel Abrahams (London, 1908).
- 'The Messianic Idea in Judaism' (1887), in *The Literary Remains of the Rev. Simeon Singer. Lectures and Addresses*, selected and edited by Israel Abrahams (London, 1908).
- Simon, O., *Faith and Experience: A Selection of Essays and Addresses* (London, 1895).
- Stallard, J., *London Pauperism amongst the Jews and Christians: An Inquiry into the Principles and Practice of Outdoor Relief in the Metropolis and the Result upon the Moral and Physical Condition of the Pauper Class* (London, 1867).
- Theta, *The Secret of Cyprus and our Eastern Protectorate* (London, 1878).

- Toland, J., 'Reasons for Naturalising the Jews in Great Britain and Ireland' (1714), in P. Mendes-Flohr and J. Reinharz (eds.), *The Jew in the Modern World: A Documentary History* (Oxford, 1995).
- Two Letters, In Answer to the Objections Urged Against Mr. Grant's Bill for the Relief of the Jews* (London, 1830).
- Van Oven, B., *Ought Baron de Rothschild to Sit in Parliament? An Imaginary Conversation between Judaeus and Amicus Nobilis* (London, 1847).
- Western, J., *Sir Moses Montefiore: The Story of his Life* (London, 1885).
- Wilkenson, J., *Israel my Glory or Israel's Mission, and the Missions of Israel* (London, 1889).
- Wolf, L., *Sir Moses Montefiore: A Centennial Biography* (London, 1884).
- Zangwill, I., *Children of the Ghetto* (London, 1892).

PRINTED SECONDARY WORKS

- Abrahams, I. *Jewish Life under Emancipation* (London, 1917).
- 'Account of the Commemoration Dinner on the Jubilee of Political Emancipation', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, 6 (1908–10), 88–110.
- Adelman, P., *Gladstone, Disraeli and Later Victorian Politics*, 3rd edn. (London, 1997).
- Adler, H., 'A Survey of Anglo-Jewish History', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, 3 (1896–8), 1–17.
- Alderman, G., *The Jewish Community in British Politics* (Oxford, 1983).
- 'English Jews or Jews of the English Persuasion? Reflections on the Emancipation of Anglo-Jewry', in P. Birnbaum and I. Katznelson (eds.), *Paths of Emancipation: Jews, States, and Citizenship* (Chichester, 1995), 128–56.
- *Modern British Jewry*, 2nd edn. (Oxford, 1998).
- Anderson, B., *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London, 1983).
- Barnett, A., 'Sussex Hall: The First Anglo-Jewish Venture in Popular Education' *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, 19 (1955–9), 65–79.
- *The Western Synagogue through Two Centuries (1761–1961)* (London, 1961).
- Baron, S., 'Abraham Benisch's Project for Jewish Colonisation in Palestine (1842)', in S. Baron and A. Marx (eds.), *Jewish Studies in Memory of George A. Kohut* (New York, 1935), 72–85.
- 'The Modern Age', in L. Schwarz (ed.), *Great Ages and Ideas of the Jewish People* (New York, 1956).
- Bauman, Z., 'Allosemitism: Premodern, Modern, Postmodern', in B. Cheyette and L. Marcus (eds.), *Modernity, Culture and 'the Jew'* (Cambridge, 1998), 143–56.

- Bauman, Z., *Liquid Modernity* (Cambridge, 2000).
- Bebbington, D., *The Nonconformist Conscience: Chapel and Politics, 1870–1914* (London, 1982).
- Bentley, M., *Politics without Democracy 1815–1914: Perception and Preoccupation in British Governments*, 2nd edn. (Oxford, 1996).
- Bentwich, N., and Shaftesley, J., 'Forerunners of Zionism in the Victorian Era', in J. Shaftesley (ed.), *Remember the Days: Essays on Anglo-Jewish History Presented to Cecil Roth* (London, 1966), 207–40.
- Berkovitz, J., *The Shaping of Jewish Identity in Nineteenth-Century France* (Detroit, 1989).
- Berlin, I., 'Benjamin Disraeli, Karl Marx and the Search for Identity', in idem, *Against the Current: Essays in the History of Ideas*, ed. H. Hardy (London, 1979), 252–86.
- Bermant, C., *The Cousinhood: The Anglo-Jewish Gentry* (New York, 1971).
- Bernardini, P., 'The Silent Retreat of the Fathers: Episodes in the Process of the Reappraisal of Jewish History and Culture in Eighteenth-Century England', in S. Jones, T. Kushner, and S. Pearce (eds.), *Cultures of Ambivalence and Contempt: Studies in Jewish–Non-Jewish Relations* (London, 1998), 100–26.
- Birnbaum, P., and Katznelson, I., 'Emancipation and the Liberal Offer', in idem (eds.), *Paths of Emancipation: Jews, States and Citizenship* (Chichester, 1995), 3–36.
- Black, E., *The Social Politics of Anglo-Jewry, 1880–1920* (Oxford, 1988).
- 'The Anglicisation of Orthodoxy: The Adlers, Father and Son', in F. Malino and D. Sorkin (eds.), *From East and West: Jews in a Changing Europe, 1750–1870* (Oxford, 1990), 295–325.
- Blake, R., *The Conservative Party from Peel to Major* (London, 1997).
- Bloom, C., 'Samuel Montagu's and Sir Moses Montefiore's Visits to Palestine in 1875', *Journal of Israeli Studies*, 17/3 (1996), 263–81.
- Boase, F., *Modern English Biography* (London, 1892; repr. 1965).
- Bolchover, R., *British Jewry and the Holocaust* (Cambridge, 1993).
- Bourne, K., *The Foreign Policy of Victorian England, 1830–1902* (Oxford, 1970).
- Brook, S., *The Club: The Jews of Modern Britain* (London, 1989).
- Brown, C., 'A Revisionist Approach to Religious Change', in S. Bruce (ed.), *Religion and Modernisation. Sociologists and Historians Debate the Secularisation Thesis* (Oxford, 1992), 31–58.
- Buber, M., 'The Jews in the World' (1934), in idem, *Israel and the World: Essays in a Time of Crisis* (New York, 1948), 167–72.
- Buckle, G., *The Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield*, vol. v (London, 1920).
- Buckman, J., *Immigrants and the Class Struggle: The Jewish Immigrant in Leeds, 1880–1914* (Manchester, 1983).
- Burn, W., *The Age of Equipoise: A Study of the Mid-Victorian Generation* (repr. Aldershot, 1994).

- Cain, P. (ed.), *Empire and Imperialism: The Debate of the 1870s* (Bristol, 1999).
- Cannadine, D., *The Decline and Fall of the British Aristocracy* (London, 1998).
- Cantor, G., *Religious Responses to Modernity and the Sciences in Britain, 1650–1900* (Oxford, 2005).
- Cesarani, D., 'Introduction', in idem (ed.), *The Making of Modern Anglo-Jewry* (Oxford, 1990), 1–14.
- 'Dual Heritage or Duel of Heritages? Englishness and Jewishness in the Heritage Industry', in T. Kushner (ed.), *The Jewish Heritage in British History: Englishness and Jewishness* (London, 1992), 29–41.
- *Reporting Antisemitism: The Jewish Chronicle, 1879–1979*, Parkes Lecture (Southampton, 1993).
- *The Jewish Chronicle and Anglo-Jewry, 1841–1991* (Cambridge, 1994).
- 'The Changing Character of Citizenship and Nationality in Britain', in D. Cesarani and M. Fulbrook (eds.), *Citizenship, Nationality and Migration in Europe* (London, 1996).
- 'British Jews', in R. Liedtke and S. Wendehorst (eds.), *The Emancipation of Catholics, Jews and Protestants: Minorities and the Nation State in Nineteenth Century Europe* (Manchester, 1999), 33–55.
- 'The Dynamics of Diaspora: The Transformation of British Jewish Identity', *Jewish Culture and History*, 4/1 (Summer 2001), 53–64.
- Chadwick, O., *The Victorian Church*, 3rd edn., 2 vols. (London, 1971).
- Cheyette, B., 'The Other Self: Anglo-Jewish Fiction and the Representation of Jews in England, 1875–1905', in D. Cesarani (ed.), *The Making of Modern Anglo-Jewry* (Oxford, 1990), 97–114.
- and Valman, N., 'Introduction: Liberalism and Antisemitism', in idem (eds.), *The Image of the Jew in European Liberal Culture, 1789–1914* (London, 2004), 1–26.
- Cohen, M., 'A Preface to the Study of Modern Jewish Political Thought', *Jewish Social Studies*, 9/2 (Winter 2003), 1–27.
- Cohen, N., 'Non-Religious Factors in the Emergence of the Chief Rabbinate', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, 21 (1962–7), 304–13.
- Cohen, S., *English Zionists and British Jews: The Communal Politics of Anglo-Jewry, 1895–1920* (Princeton, 1982).
- Colley, L., 'Britishness and Otherness: An Argument', *Journal of British Studies*, 31/4 (Oct. 1992), 309–29.
- *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707–1837* (London, 1996).
- Darwin, J., 'Imperialism and the Victorians: The Dynamics of Territorial Expansion', *English Historical Review*, 112/447 (June 1997), 614–42.
- Davis, J., *Reforming London: The Government Problem, 1855–1900* (Oxford, 1988).
- Davis, M., 'Mixed Marriage in Western Jewry: Historical Background to the Jewish Response', *Jewish Journal of Sociology*, 10/2 (Dec. 1968), 177–220.
- Davis, R., *The English Rothschilds* (London, 1985).

- Elton, B., 'Did the Chief Rabbinate Move to the Right? A Case Study: The Mixed Choir Controversy, 1880–1986', *Jewish Historical Studies*, 39 (2004), 121–52.
- Emden, P., *Jews of Britain: A Series of Biographies* (London, 1944).
- Encyclopaedia Judaica* (Jerusalem, 1971).
- Endelman, T., *The Jews of Georgian England, 1714–1830: Tradition and Change in a Liberal Society* (Philadelphia, 1979).
- 'Native Jews and Foreign Jews in London, 1870–1914', in D. Berger (ed.), *The Legacy of Jewish Migration: 1881 and its Impact* (New York, 1983), 109–30.
- 'Communal Solidarity among the Jewish Elite of Victorian London', *Victorian Studies*, 28/3 (1985), 491–526.
- 'Introduction', in idem (ed.), *Jewish Apostasy in the Modern World* (New York, 1987), 1–19.
- 'The Englishness of Jewish Modernity in England', in J. Katz (ed.), *Toward Modernity: The European Jewish Model* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1987), 225–46.
- 'The Social and Political Context of Conversion in Germany and England, 1870–1914', in idem (ed.), *Jewish Apostasy in the Modern World* (New York, 1987), 83–107.
- 'The Chequered Career of "Jew" King: A Study in Anglo-Jewish Social History', in F. Malino and D. Sorkin (eds.), *From East to West: Jews in Changing Europe, 1750–1870* (Oxford, 1990), 151–81.
- *Radical Assimilation in English Jewish History, 1656–1945* (Bloomington, Ind., 1990).
- 'English Jewish History', *Modern Judaism*, 11/1 (Feb. 1991), 91–109.
- 'The Frankaus of London: A Study in Radical Assimilation, 1837–1967', *Jewish History*, 8/1–2 (1994), 117–54.
- 'Making Jews Modern: Some Jewish and Gentile Misunderstandings in the Age of Emancipation', in M. Raphael (ed.), *What is Modern about the Modern Jewish Experience?* (Williamsburg, Va., 1997), 18–32.
- 'Jewish Self-Hatred in Britain and Germany', in M. Brenner, R. Liedtke, and D. Rechter (eds.), *Two Nations: British and German Jews in Comparative Perspective* (Tübingen, 1999), 331–64.
- 'Benjamin Disraeli and the Myth of Sephardi Superiority', in T. Endelman and T. Kushner (eds.), *Disraeli's Jewishness* (London, 2002), 23–39.
- *The Jews of Britain, 1656 to 2000* (London, 2002).
- Englander, D., 'Anglicised not Anglican: Jews and Judaism in Victorian Britain', in G. Parsons (ed.), *Religion in Victorian Britain*, vol. i (Manchester, 1988), 235–73.
- 'The Word and the World: Evangelism in the Victorian City', in G. Parsons (ed.), *Religion in Victorian Britain*, vol. ii (Manchester, 1988), 15–36.
- 'Booth's Jews: The Presentation of Jews and Judaism in *Life and Labour of the People in London*', *Victorian Studies*, 32/4 (Summer 1989), 551–71.

- Englander, D. (ed.), *A Documentary History of Jewish Immigrants in Britain, 1840–1920* (London, 1994).
- Feldman, D., ‘There was an Englishman, Irishman and Jew . . . : Immigrants and Minorities in Britain’, Review Article, *Historical Journal*, 26/1 (Mar. 1983), 185–99.
- ‘Jews in London, 1880–1914’, in R. Samuel (ed.), *Patriotism: The Making and Unmaking of British National Identity*, vol. ii (London, 1989), 207–29.
- ‘The Importance of Being English: Jewish Immigration and the Decay of Liberal England’, in D. Feldman and G. Jones (eds.), *Metropolis London: Histories and Representations since 1800* (London, 1989), 56–84.
- *Englishmen and Jews: Social Politics and Political Culture, 1840–1914* (London, 1994).
- ‘Jews and the State in Britain’, in M. Brenner, R. Liedtke, and D. Rechter (eds.), *Two Nations: British and German Jews in Comparative Perspective* (Tübingen, 1999), 141–61.
- ‘Was Modernity Good for the Jews?’, in B. Cheyette and L. Marcus (eds.), *Modernity, Culture and ‘the Jew’* (Cambridge, 1998), 171–87.
- Feldman, E., ‘The Question of Emancipation in the Ottoman Empire and the Danubian Principalities after the Crimean War’, *Jewish Social Studies*, 41/1 (Winter 1979), 41–74.
- Felsenstein, F., *Antisemitic Stereotypes: A Paradigm of Otherness in English Popular Culture, 1660–1830* (London, 1995).
- Ferguson, N., ‘“The Caucasian Royal Family”: The Rothschilds in National Contexts’, in M. Brenner, R. Liedtke, and D. Rechter (eds.), *Two Nations: British and German Jews in Comparative Perspective* (Tübingen, 1999), 295–326.
- *The House of Rothschild*, ii: *The World’s Banker, 1849–1998* (London, 2000).
- Feuchtwanger, E., ‘“Jew Feelings” and Realpolitik: Disraeli and the Making of Foreign and Imperial Policy’, in T. Endelman and T. Kushner (eds.), *Disraeli’s Jewishness* (London, 2002), 180–96.
- Finestein, I., ‘Jewish Emancipationists in Victorian England: Self-Imposed Limits to Assimilation’, in J. Frankel and S. Zipperstein (eds.), *Assimilation and Community: The Jews in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Cambridge, 1992), 38–56.
- ‘A Modern Examination of Macaulay’s Case for the Civil Emancipation of the Jews’, in idem, *Jewish Society in Victorian England* (London, 1993), 78–103.
- ‘Anglo-Jewish Opinion during the Struggle for Emancipation (1828–1858)’, in idem, *Jewish Society in Victorian England* (London, 1993), 1–53.
- ‘Arthur Cohen QC, 1829–1914’, in idem, *Jewish Society in Victorian England* (London, 1993), 305–26.
- ‘Post-Emancipation Jewry: The Anglo-Jewish Experience’, in idem, *Jewish Society in Victorian England* (London, 1993), 154–81.

- 'Sir George Jessel, 1824–83', in idem, *Jewish Society in Victorian England* (London, 1993), 257–304.
- 'Some Modern Themes in the Emancipation Debate in Early Victorian England', in idem, *Jewish Society in Victorian England* (London, 1993), 130–53.
- 'The Anglo-Jewish Revolt of 1853', in idem, *Jewish Society in Victorian England* (London, 1993), 104–29.
- 'The Jews and the English Marriage Law during the Emancipation', in idem, *Jewish Society in Victorian England* (London, 1993), 54–77.
- 'The Uneasy Victorian: Montefiore as Communal Leader', in idem, *Jewish Society in Victorian England* (London, 1993), 227–56.
- 'Early Victorian Anglo-Jewry: Aspirations and Reality', in idem, *Anglo-Jewry in Changing Times: Studies in Diversity, 1840–1914* (London, 1999), 1–52.
- 'Hermann Adler (1839–1911): Portrait of Jewish Victorian Extraordinary', in idem, *Anglo-Jewry in Changing Times: Studies in Diversity, 1840–1914* (London, 1999), 215–50.
- 'Religious Disabilities at Oxford and Cambridge and the Movement for Abolition, 1771–1871', in idem, *Anglo-Jewry in Changing Times: Studies in Diversity, 1840–1914* (London, 1999), 102–39.
- 'The Anglo-Jewish Pastorate (1840–90)', in idem, *Anglo-Jewry in Changing Times: Studies in Diversity, 1840–1914* (London, 1999), 53–81.
- 'Anglo-Jewish Attitudes to Jewish Day-School Education, 1850–1950', in idem, *Scenes and Personalities in Anglo-Jewry, 1800–2000* (London, 2002), 52–95.
- 'Sir Moses Montefiore: A Modern Appreciation', in idem, *Scenes and Personalities in Anglo-Jewry, 1800–2000* (London, 2002), 164–77.
- Fishman, W., *East End Jewish Radicals, 1875–1914* (London, 1975).
- Frankel, J., 'Assimilation and the Jews in Nineteenth-Century Europe: Towards a New Historiography', in J. Frankel and S. Zipperstein (eds.), *Assimilation and Community: The Jews in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Cambridge, 1992), 1–37.
- *The Damascus Affair: 'Ritual Murder', Politics, and the Jews in 1840* (Cambridge, 1997).
- Galchinsky, M., *The Origin of the Modern Jewish Woman Writer* (Detroit, 1996).
- Gardis, R., 'Jewish Tradition in the Modern World: Conservatism and Renewal', in A. Jamison (ed.), *Tradition and Change in Jewish Experience* (Syracuse, NY, 1977), 141–68.
- Gartner, L., *The Jewish Immigrant in England, 1870–1914* (London, 1960).
- 'A Quarter Century of Anglo-Jewish Historiography', *Jewish Social Studies*, 48/2 (Spring 1986), 105–26.
- 'Emancipation, Social Change and Communal Reconstruction in Anglo-Jewry, 1789–1881', *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, 54 (1987), 73–116.

- Gartner, L. *A History of the Jews in Modern Times* (Oxford, 2001).
- Gilam, A., *The Emancipation of the Jews in England, 1830–1860* (London, 1982).
- 'The Burial Grounds Controversy between Anglo-Jewry and the Victorian Board of Health, 1850', *Jewish Social Studies*, 45/2 (Spring 1983), 147–56.
- Gilbert, A., *Religion and Society in Industrial England: Church, Chapel and Social Change, 1740–1914* (New York, 1976).
- Gitelman, Z., 'The Decline of the Diaspora Jewish Nation: Boundaries, Content, and Jewish Identity', *Jewish Social Studies*, 4/2 (Winter 1998), 112–32.
- Goldman, L., *Science, Reform, and Politics in Victorian Britain. The Social Science Association, 1857–1886* (Cambridge, 2002).
- Goodman, P., *Moses Montefiore* (Philadelphia, 1925).
- Goulston, M., 'The Status of the Anglo-Jewish Rabbinate, 1840–1914', *Jewish Journal of Sociology*, 10/1 (June 1968), 55–82.
- Green, A., 'Rethinking Sir Moses Montefiore: Religion, Nationhood and International Philanthropy in the Nineteenth Century', *American Historical Review*, 110/3 (June 2005), 631–58.
- Greenfeld, L., *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity* (London, 1992).
- Grizzard, N., 'The Provinces and the Board, 1851–1901', in A. Newman (ed.), *Provincial Jewry in Victorian Britain* (London, 1975), 4–11.
- Gutwein, D., *The Divided Elite: Economics, Politics and Anglo-Jewry, 1882–1917* (Leiden, 1992).
- Hanham, H., *Elections and Party Management. Politics in the Time of Disraeli and Gladstone* (London, 1959).
- Heinemann, F., *Existentialism and the Modern Predicament*, 3rd edn. (London, 1958).
- Helly, D., '"Informed" Opinion on Tropical Africa in Great Britain, 1860–1890', *African Affairs*, 68/272 (July 1969), 195–217.
- Henriques, H., *The Jews and the English Law* (Oxford, 1908).
- *Jewish Marriages and the English Law* (London, 1909).
- 'Reflections on the History of the Anglo-Jewish Community', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, 9 (1918–20), 131–42.
- Henriques, U., 'The Jewish Emancipation Controversy in Nineteenth-Century Britain', *Past and Present*, 40 (July 1968), 126–46.
- 'Journey to Romania, 1867', in S. Lipman and V. Lipman (eds.), *The Century of Moses Montefiore* (Oxford, 1985), 230–53.
- 'Lyons vs. Thomas: The Jewess Abduction Case', *Jewish Historical Studies*, 29 (1982–6), 267–80.
- Herman, S., *Jewish Identity: A Social Psychological Perspective* (London, 1977).
- Herrman, L., *A History of the Jews in South Africa* (London, 1930).
- Holmes, C., *Antisemitism in British Society, 1876–1939* (London, 1979).
- *John Bull's Island: Immigration and British Society, 1871–1971* (Basingstoke, 1988).

- Homa, B., *Orthodoxy in Anglo-Jewry, 1880–1940* (London, 1969).
- Huttenback, R., 'The Patrician Jew and the British Ethos in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries', *Jewish Social Studies*, 40/1 (1978), 49–62.
- Hyam, R., *Britain's Imperial Century, 1815–1914: A Study of Empire and Expansion*, 3rd edn. (Basingstoke, 2002).
- Hyamson, A. (ed.), *The British Consulate in Jerusalem in Relation to the Jews of Palestine*, 2 vols. (London, 1939).
- *David Salomons* (London, 1939).
- *The Sephardim of England: A History of the Spanish and Portuguese Jewish Community, 1492–1951* (London, 1951).
- *The London Board of Shechita, 1804–1954* (London, 1954).
- *Jews' College, London, 1855–1955* (London, 1955).
- Hyman, P., 'Gender and the Shaping of Modern Jewish Identities', *Jewish Social Studies*, 8/2–3 (Winter/Spring 2002), 153–61.
- Itzkowitz, D., 'Cultural Pluralism and the Board of Deputies of British Jews', in R. Davis and R. Helmstadter (eds.), *Religion and Irreligion in Victorian Society: Essays in Honour of R. K. Webb* (London, 1992), 85–101.
- Jacobs, J., 'The Typical Character of Anglo-Jewish History', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, 3 (1896–8), 126–43.
- James, C., *M.P. for Dewsbury* (Brighouse, 1970).
- Jolles, M., *Samuel Isaac, Saul Isaac and Nathaniel Isaacs* (London, 1998).
- *A Directory of Distinguished British Jews, 1830–1930: With Selected Compilations Extending from 1830 to 2000* (London, 2002).
- Jubilee of the Joint Foreign Committee, 1878–1928*, issued by the Board of Deputies and the Anglo-Jewish Association (London, 1928).
- Kadish, S., 'The "Cathedral Synagogues" of England', *Jewish Historical Studies*, 39 (2004), 45–78.
- Kaplan, M., *Alienation and Identification* (London, 1976).
- Kaplan, Y., *An Alternative Path to Modernity: The Sephardi Diaspora in Western Europe* (Leiden, 2000).
- Katz, D., 'English Redemption and Jewish Readmission in 1656', *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 34 (1983), 73–91.
- 'The Marginalisation of Early Modern Anglo-Jewish History', in T. Kushner (ed.), *The Jewish Heritage in British History: Englishness and Jewishness* (London, 1992), 60–77.
- *The Jews in the History of England 1485–1850* (Oxford, 1994).
- and Popkin, R., *Messianic Revolution: Radical Religious Politics to the End of the Second Millennium* (London, 1999).
- Katz, J., 'The Term "Jewish Emancipation": Its Origin and Historical Impact', in idem, *Emancipation and Assimilation: Studies in Modern Jewish History* (Farnborough, 1972), 21–46.
- *Out of the Ghetto: The Social Background of Jewish Emancipation, 1770–1870* (New York, 1978).

- Katz, J. 'Introduction', in idem (ed.), *Towards Modernity: The European Jewish Model* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1987), 1–12.
- *Tradition and Crisis: Jewish Society at the End of the Middle Ages* (New York, 1993).
- Kershner, A., and Romain, J., *Tradition and Change: A History of Reform Judaism in Britain 1840–1995* (London, 1995).
- Kertzer, D., *The Kidnapping of Edgardo Mortara* (London, 1997).
- Kessler, E. (ed.), *An English Jew: The Life and Writing of Claude Montefiore*, 2nd edn. (London, 2002).
- Kidd, C., *British Identities before Nationalism: Ethnicity and Nationhood in the Atlantic World, 1600–1800* (Cambridge, 1999).
- Krauz, E., *Leeds Jewry: Its History and Social Structure* (Cambridge, 1964).
- Kushner, T., 'The Impact of British Antisemitism, 1918–1945', in D. Cesarani (ed.), *The Making of Modern Anglo-Jewry* (Oxford, 1990), 191–208.
- 'A History of Jewish Archives in the United Kingdom', *Archives*, 20/87 (Apr. 1992), 3–16.
- 'Heritage and Ethnicity: An Introduction', in idem (ed.), *The Jewish Heritage in British History: Englishness and Jewishness* (London, 1992), 1–28.
- 'The End of the "Anglo-Jewish Progress Show": Representations of the East End, 1887–1987', in idem (ed.), *The Jewish Heritage in British History: Englishness and Jewishness* (London, 1992), 78–105.
- and Knox, K., *Refugees in an Age of Genocide: Global, National and Local Perspectives during the Twentieth Century* (London, 1999).
- and Valman, N. (eds.), *Remembering Cable Street: Fascism and Anti-Fascism in British Society* (London, 2000).
- Langton, D., *Claude Montefiore: His Life and Thought* (London, 2002).
- Lebzelter, G., *Political Antisemitism in England, 1918–1939* (London, 1978).
- Levenberg, S., *The Board and Zion: An Historical Survey* (Hull, 1985).
- Levin, S., 'The Origins of the Jews' Free School', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, 19 (1955–9), 97–114.
- Levy, M., *The Western Synagogue: Some Materials for its History* (London, 1897), repr. in C. Roth, *Records of the Western Synagogue, 1761–1932* (London, 1932), 115–91.
- Levy, S., 'Anglo-Jewish Historiography', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, 6 (1908–10), 1–20.
- Lewis, B., *The Middlemost and the Mill Towns: Bourgeois Culture and Politics in Early Industrial England* (Stanford, Calif., 2001).
- Liberles, R., 'From Toleration to *Verbesserung*: German and English Debates on the Jews in the Eighteenth-Century', *Central European History*, 22/1 (1989), 3–32.
- Liedtke, R., *Jewish Welfare in Hamburg and Manchester, c.1850–1914* (Oxford, 1998).
- Lipman, S., 'The Making of a Victorian Gentleman', in S. Lipman and V. Lipman (eds.), *The Century of Moses Montefiore* (Oxford, 1985), 3–22.

- Lipman, V., *Social History of the Jews in England, 1850–1950* (London, 1954).
- *A Century of Social Service, 1859–1959: The Jewish Board of Guardians* (London, 1959).
- ‘Social Topography of a London Congregation: The Bayswater Synagogue, 1863–1963’, *Jewish Journal of Sociology*, 6/1 (July 1964), 69–74.
- Lipset, S., ‘The Study of Jewish Communities in a Comparative Context’, *Jewish Journal of Sociology*, 5/2 (Dec. 1963), 157–66.
- Littman, D., ‘Mission to Morocco (1863–1864)’, in S. Lipman and V. Lipman (eds.), *The Century of Moses Montefiore* (Oxford, 1985), 171–229.
- Livshin, R., ‘The Acculturation of the Children of Immigrant Jews in Manchester, c.1890–1920’, in D. Cesarani (ed.), *The Making of Modern Anglo-Jewry* (Oxford, 1990), 79–96.
- Loewe, R., ‘Jewish Scholarship in England’, in V. Lipman (ed.), *Three Centuries of Anglo-Jewish History* (Cambridge, 1961), 125–48.
- Lorimer, D., ‘Race, Science and Culture: Historical Continuities and Discontinuities, 1850–1915’, in S. West (ed.), *The Victorians and Race* (Aldershot, 1996), 12–33.
- McCord, N., *British History, 1815–1906* (Oxford, 1991).
- McLeod, H., *Religion and the Working Class in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (London, 1984).
- ‘Why did Orthodoxy Remain Dominant in Britain? A Comment on Michael A. Meyer’, in M. Brenner, R. Liedtke, and D. Rechter (eds.), *Two Nations: British and German Jews in Comparative Perspective* (Tübingen, 1999), 85–90.
- Magnus, L., *The Jewish Board of Guardians and the Men Who Made It, 1859–1909* (London, 1909).
- Malino, F., *The Sephardic Jews of Bordeaux: Assimilation and Emancipation in Revolutionary and Napoleonic France* (Tuscaloosa, Ala., 1978).
- Mandler, P., ‘Race and “Nation” in Mid-Victorian Thought’, in S. Collini, R. Whatmore, and B. Young (eds.), *History, Religion and Culture: British Intellectual History, 1750–1950* (Cambridge, 2000), 224–44.
- *The English National Character: The History of an Idea from Edmund Burke to Tony Blair* (London, 2006).
- Mendes-Flohr, P., and Reinhartz, J. (eds.), *The Jew in the Modern World: A Documentary History*, 2nd edn. (Oxford, 1995).
- Meyer, M., *Jewish Identity in the Modern World* (London, 1990).
- ‘Introduction’, in idem (ed.), *German-Jewish History in Modern Times*, vol. ii (New York, 1997), 1–4.
- ‘Becoming German, Remaining Jewish’, in idem (ed.), *German-Jewish History in Modern Times*, vol. ii (New York, 1997), 199–250.
- ‘Jewish Self-Understanding’, in idem (ed.), *German-Jewish History in Modern Times*, vol. ii (New York, 1997), 128–67.

- Meyer, M. 'Jewish Religious Reform in Germany and Britain', in M. Brenner, R. Liedtke, and D. Rechter (eds.), *Two Nations: British and German Jews in Comparative Perspective* (Tübingen, 1999), 67–84.
- Montagu, L., *Samuel Montagu: First Baron Swaythling* (London, 1913).
- Mosse, W., 'From *Schutzjuden* to *Deutsche Staatsbürger Jüdischen Glaubens*: The Long and Bumpy Road of Jewish Emancipation in Germany', in P. Birnbaum and I. Katznelson (eds.), *Paths of Emancipation: Jews, States and Citizenship* (Chichester, 1995), 59–93.
- Newman, A., 'The Board of Deputies', in idem (ed.), *Provincial Jewry in Victorian Britain* (London, 1975), 1–3.
- *The United Synagogue, 1870–1970* (London, 1977).
- 'The Historian in Two Worlds', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, 26 (1974–8), 1–5.
- *The Board of Deputies of British Jews, 1760–1985: A Brief Survey* (London, 1987).
- 'The Historiography of Anglo-Jewry, 1892–1992', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, 33 (1992–4), 215–24.
- Obelkevich, J., 'Religion', in F. Thompson (ed.), *The Cambridge Social History of Britain, 1750–1950*, vol. iii (Cambridge, 1990), 311–56.
- O'Day, R., 'The Clerical Renaissance in Victorian England and Wales', in G. Parsons (ed.), *Religion in Britain*, vol. i (Manchester, 1988), 184–212.
- Panayi, P., *Immigration, Ethnicity and Racism in Britain, 1815–1945* (Manchester, 1994).
- Parfitt, T., 'Dhimma versus Protection in Nineteenth Century Morocco', in idem (ed.), *Israel and Ishmael: Studies in Muslim–Jewish Relations* (Richmond, 2000), 142–66.
- Parry, J., *Democracy and Religion: Gladstone and the Liberal Party, 1867–1875* (Cambridge, 1986).
- Parsons, G., 'Introduction: Victorian Religion, Paradox and Variety', in idem (ed.), *Religion in Britain*, vol. i (Manchester, 1988), 1–13.
- 'From Dissenters to Free Churchmen: The Transitions of Victorian Non-conformity', in idem (ed.), *Religion in Britain*, vol. i (Manchester, 1988), 67–116.
- 'Reform, Revival and Realignment: The Experience of Victorian Anglicanism', in idem (ed.), *Religion in Britain*, vol. i (Manchester, 1988), 14–66.
- 'Victorian Roman Catholicism: Emancipation, Expansion and Achievement', in idem (ed.), *Religion in Britain*, vol. i (Manchester, 1988), 146–83.
- Pelling, H., *A History of British Trade Unionism*, 5th edn. (London, 1992).
- Perry, T., *Public Opinion, Propaganda, and Politics in Eighteenth-Century England: A Study of the Jew Bill of 1753* (Cambridge, Mass., 1962).
- Phillips, O., and Simons, H., *The History of the Bayswater Synagogue, 1863–1963* (London, 1963).
- Pinkus, B. *The Jews of the Soviet Union: The History of a National Minority* (Cambridge, 1988).

- Pollins, H., *Economic History of the Jews of England* (London, 1982).
- Prochaska, F., 'Philanthropy', in F. Thompson (ed.), *The Cambridge Social History of Britain, 1750–1950*, vol. iii (Cambridge, 1990), 357–94.
- Ragusis, M., *Figures of Conversion: 'The Jewish Question' and English National Identity* (London, 1995).
- Reif, S., *Judaism and Hebrew Prayer: New Perspectives on Jewish Liturgical History* (Cambridge, 1993).
- Reifowitz, I., *Imagining an Austrian Nation: Joseph Samuel Bloch and the Search for a Multiethnic Austrian Identity, 1846–1919* (New York, 2003).
- Richmond, C., 'Englishness and Medieval Anglo-Jewry', in T. Kushner (ed.), *The Jewish Heritage in British History: Englishness and Jewishness* (London, 1992), 42–59.
- Roberts, D., *Existentialism and Religious Belief* (New York, 1959).
- Robertson, R., 'The Representation of the Jews in British and German Literature: A Comparison', in M. Brenner, R. Liedtke, and D. Rechter (eds.), *Two Nations: British and German Jews in Comparative Perspective* (Tübingen, 1999), 411–42.
- Rose, G., *Judaism and Modernity: Philosophical Essays* (Oxford, 1993).
- Roth, C., *The Challenge of Jewish History: Some Jewish Contributions to English Life*, Presidential Address to the Jewish Historical Society of England (London, 1936).
- *The Jew as a European* (London, 1938).
- *A History of the Jews in England* (Oxford, 1941).
- *History of the Great Synagogue, 1690–1940* (London, 1950).
- *Two Cradles of Jewish Liberty: The New World and the Mother Country* (London, 1954).
- 'Moses Montefiore, 1784–1885', in idem, *Essays and Portraits in Anglo-Jewish History* (Philadelphia, 1962), 262–76.
- 'The *Haskalah* in England', in I. Finestein, J. Rabbinowitz, and H. Zimmels (eds.), *Essays Presented to Chief Rabbi Israel Brodie on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (London, 1967), 365–76.
- Rozin, M., *The Rich and the Poor: Jewish Philanthropy and Social Control in Nineteenth-Century London* (Brighton 1999).
- Rubinstein, H., *The Jews in Australia: A Thematic History. 1: 1788–1945* (Melbourne, 1991).
- Rubinstein, W., 'Jews among Top British Wealth Holders, 1857–1969: Decline of the Golden Age', *Jewish Social Studies*, 34/1 (1972), 73–84.
- *A History of the Jews in the English Speaking World: Great Britain* (Basingstoke, 1996).
- 'Jewish Top Wealth-Holders in Britain, 1809–1909', *Jewish Historical Studies*, 37 (2001), 133–62.
- 'The Decline and Fall of Anglo-Jewry?', *Jewish Historical Studies*, 38 (2002), 13–22.

- Ruderman, D., *Jewish Enlightenment in an English Key: Anglo-Jewry's Construction of Modern Jewish Thought* (Oxford, 2000).
- Rürup, R., 'The Tortuous and Thorny Path to Legal Equality: "Jew Laws" and Emancipatory Legislation in Germany from the Late Eighteenth Century', *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook*, 31 (1986), 3–34.
- 'Jewish Emancipation in Britain and Germany', in M. Brenner, R. Liedtke, and D. Rechter (eds.), *Two Nations: British and German Jews in Comparative Perspective* (Tübingen, 1999), 49–62.
- Rutland, S., *The Jews in Australia* (Melbourne, 2005).
- Sacks, J., *One People? Tradition, Modernity, and Jewish Unity* (London, 1993).
- Salbstein, M., *The Emancipation of the Jews in Britain: An Essay on the Preconditions* (Brighton, 1977).
- *The Emancipation of the Jews in Britain: The Question of the Admission of the Jews to Parliament, 1828–1860* (London, 1982).
- Schwarz, L., 'Introduction: Historians to the Reader', in L. Schwarz (ed.), *Great Ages and Ideas of the Jewish People* (New York, 1956).
- Scult, M., *Millennial Expectations and Jewish Liberties: A Study of the Efforts to Convert the Jews in Britain up to the Mid-Nineteenth Century* (Leiden, 1978).
- Seton-Watson, R., *Disraeli, Gladstone and the Eastern Question: A Study in Diplomacy and Party Politics* (London, 1971).
- Shannon, R., *Gladstone and the Bulgarian Agitation, 1876*, 2nd edn. (Hassocks, 1976).
- Sharot, S., 'Secularisation, Judaism, and Anglo-Jewry', *A Sociological Yearbook of Religion in Britain*, 4 (London, 1971), 122–40.
- 'Religious Change in Native Orthodoxy in London, 1870–1914: The Synagogue Service', *Jewish Journal of Sociology*, 15/1 (June 1973), 57–78.
- 'Religious Change in Native Orthodoxy in London, 1870–1914: Rabbinate and Clergy', *Jewish Journal of Sociology*, 15/2 (Dec. 1973), 167–87.
- Singer, I. (ed.), *The Jewish Encyclopaedia* (London, 1901).
- Singer, S., 'The Anglo-Jewish Ministry in Early Victorian London', *Modern Judaism*, 5/3 (Oct. 1985), 279–300.
- 'Jewish Religious Observance in Early Victorian London, 1840–1860', *Jewish Journal of Sociology*, 28/2 (Dec. 1986), 117–37.
- 'Jewish Education in the Mid-Nineteenth Century: A Case Study of the Early Victorian London Community', *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 77/2–3 (Oct. 1986–Jan. 1987), 163–78.
- Smith, P., *Disraelian Conservatism and Social Reform* (London, 1967).
- 'Introduction', in idem (ed.), *Ethnic Groups in International Relations: Comparative Studies on Governments and Non-Dominant Ethnic Groups in Europe, 1850–1940*, vol. v (Aldershot, 1991), 1–12.
- Smith, R., 'The London Jews' Society and Patterns of Jewish Conversion in England, 1801–1859', *Jewish Social Studies*, 43/3–4 (1981), 275–90.

- Sorkin, D., 'Jewish Emancipation in Central and Western Europe in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries', in D. Englander (ed.), *The Jewish Enigma: An Enduring People* (Milton Keynes, 1992), 81–110.
- 'Port Jews and the Three Regions of Emancipation', in D. Cesarani (ed.), *Port Jews: Jewish Communities in Cosmopolitan Maritime Trading Centres, 1550–1950* (London, 2002), 31–46.
- Stapleton, J., 'Political Thought and National Identity in Britain, 1850–1950', in S. Collini, R. Whatmore, and B. Young (eds.), *History, Religion and Culture: British Intellectual History, 1750–1950* (Cambridge, 2000), 245–69.
- Stephen, L., and Lee, S. (eds.), *The Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 1998).
- Steyn, J., *The Jew: Assumptions of Identity* (London, 1999).
- Thomas, T., 'Foreign Missions and Missionaries in Victorian Britain', in J. Wolfe (ed.), *Religion in Victorian Britain*, vol. v (Manchester, 1997), 101–34.
- Thompson, D., 'The Liberation Society, 1844–1868', in P. Hollis (ed.), *Pressure from Without in Early Victorian England* (London, 1974), 210–38.
- Trevor-Roper, H., *Jewish and Other Nationalism* (London, 1962).
- Turner, F., 'The Victorian Crisis of Faith and the Faith that was Lost', in R. Helmstadter and B. Lightman (eds.), *Victorian Faith in Crisis: Essays on Continuity and Change in Nineteenth-Century Religious Belief* (London, 1990), 9–38.
- Umansky, E. (ed.), *Lily Montagu: Sermons, Addresses, Letters and Prayers* (New York, 1985).
- Vital, D., 'European Jewry 1860–1919: Political Organisation and Trans-State Political Action', in P. Smith (ed.), *Ethnic Groups in International Relations: Comparative Studies on Governments and Non-Dominant Ethnic Groups in Europe, 1850–1940*, vol. v (Aldershot, 1991), 39–58.
- *A People Apart: A Political History of the Jews in Europe, 1789–1939* (Oxford, 1999).
- Waller, P., *Democracy and Sectarianism: A Political and Social History of Liverpool, 1868–1939* (Liverpool, 1981).
- Wallis, R., and Bruce, S., 'Secularisation: The Orthodox Model', in S. Bruce (ed.), *Religion and Modernisation: Sociologists and Historians Debate the Secularisation Thesis* (Oxford, 1992), 8–30.
- Wasserstein, B., "'As Individuals Everything. . . As a Group Nothing": The Flawed Emancipation of the Jews in Europe', Review Article, *European Studies Review*, 12/2 (Apr. 1982), 199–206.
- 'The End of Anglo-Jewish History?', *Jewish Historical Studies*, 37 (2001), 1–14.
- West, S., 'Introduction', in idem (ed.), *The Victorians and Race* (Aldershot, 1996), 1–11.
- Whitehill, G. (ed.), *Bevis Marks Records, Part III* (London, 1973).

- Whitfield, S., 'Enigmas of Modern Jewish Identity', *Jewish Social Studies*, 8/2–3 (Winter/Spring 2002), 162–7.
- Who's Who of British Members of Parliament*, i: 1832–1885 (Hassocks, 1976).
- Who's Who of British Members of Parliament*, ii: 1886–1918 (Hassocks, 1978).
- Who was Who, 1897–1916: A Companion to 'Who's Who' Containing the Biographies of Those Who Died during the Period, 1897–1916* (London, 1920).
- Who was Who, 1916–1928: A Companion to 'Who's Who' Containing the Biographies of Those Who Died during the Period, 1916–1928* (London, 1947).
- Williams, B., 'The Antisemitism of Tolerance: Middle-Class Manchester and the Jews, 1870–1900', in A. Kidd and K. Roberts (eds.), *City, Class and Culture: Studies of Social Policy and Cultural Production in Victorian Manchester* (Manchester, 1985), 74–102.
- *The Making of Manchester Jewry, 1740–1875* (Manchester, 1985).
- '“East and West”: Class and Community in Manchester Jewry, 1850–1914', in D. Cesarani (ed.), *The Making of Modern Anglo-Jewry* (Oxford, 1990), 15–33.
- Wolf, L., 'A Plea for Anglo-Jewish History', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, 1 (1893–4), 1–7.
- 'The Queen's Jewry, 1837–1897', in C. Roth (ed.), *Essays in Jewish History* (London, 1934), 309–62.
- Zangwill, I., 'The Ghetto', in M. Simon (ed.), *Speeches, Articles and Letters of Israel Zangwill* (London, 1937), 3–27.

THESES

- Hochberg, S., 'The Jewish Community and the Aliens Question in Great Britain, 1881–1917' (Ph.D. thesis, University of New York, 1989).
- Lammers, B., 'A Superior Kind of English: Jewish Ethnicity and English Identity in London's East End, 1905–1939' (Ph.D. thesis, State University of New Jersey, Oct. 1997).
- Levi D'Ancona, L., 'Paths of Jewish Integration: Upper-Middle-Class Families in Nineteenth-Century France, Italy and England' (Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge, Jan. 2004).

Index

- Adler, Hermann, Chief Rabbi 177,
179, 184, 186, 188, 189, 202,
217, 232, 248
- Adler, Nathan, Chief Rabbi 33, 34, 37,
40, 141, 143, 145, 150n., 171,
177, 179, 190, 192, 199, 218
- Alexander, David Lindo 120
- Alliance Israélite Universelle* 145–6,
149–2, 153, 156, 159n., 161, 168
- Ambiguity 46, 263
in Anglo-Jewish existence 24, 26,
48, 174, 248, 264
- Ambivalence 2
in Anglo-Jewish existence 24, 33,
38, 39, 49, 174, 248, 263–4
in Jewish existence 5
- Anglican, *see* Church of England
- Anglo-Jewish Association 104, 121,
145, 164, 168, 204
Conjoint Foreign Committee, *see*
Board of Deputies
Formation of 148, 150–1, 152–3
- Anglo-Jewish Exhibition 252–5
- Anglo-Jewry 18, 20 n., 26, 41, 44, 73,
107, 251–2
- Access to University 9, 57, 74–6
- Acculturation of 18, 24, 28, 37, 70,
125, 173–4, 180, 183–4,
186–7, 218–9, 221, 261
- Anglicisation of 24, 32–3, 173–4,
178, 185, 187, 195, 240–2
- Attitude to foreign affairs 89–90,
93, 94, 101, 103–4
- Charity 37, 229–5, 260
- Class issues 135, 185–7, 197–9,
200–1, 221, 232–3
- Communal leadership 19–20, 38,
81, 225, 233, 242
- Community 27–8, 37, 38, 43, 67,
121, 140–3, 261
- Education 37, 76–8, 133,
195–201, 219, 261
- Emancipation of 7, 9–11, 30–5, 38,
44, 47–48, 50, 69, 74, 83, 130,
132, 133, 165–6, 170, 171,
218, 236, 256–7, 262, *see also*
Jewish Relief Act
- Gentile opinions toward 35–6,
44–7
- Jewish opinions toward 32–4,
36–7, 42
- Jewish strategy toward 35–6, 38,
43
- Equality 31, 35, 47–48, 70, 74–6,
106–7, 130–3, 136–7,
259
- Identity 19, 29, 31, 33, 47–9, 66,
68, 96, 126, 129, 148, 170,
198, 204, 208, 239–41, 253,
255, 256–7, 261, 263–4
- Consonance with British
identity 89, 99–100, 107,
164–6, 167–8, 212, 215,
231, 258
- Duality of 24, 48, 88, 105–8,
109, 117, 138, 150, 167–8,
173, 179–80, 189, 213, 214,
217, 220, 229, 247–8, 254,
257–8, 259, 261
- Ethnic dimensions of 88, 208,
245–8, 249
- as Nonconformists 24, 74, 76–7,
95n., 106, 110, 142
- Integration of 12, 29, 77, 125, 199,
204–6, 237–238, 257
- and Jewish immigration 138–9,
142, 181, 198, 211, 224–6,
228, 234, 238, 239–2,
260
- Marriage 34, 137–141
- Nationality 32, 41–2, 96, 186,
247–248, 250
- Party Politics 82–6, 88, 94
- Political attitudes 65–6, 68–70,
72, 76–7, 101, 103–5, 106,
134–5
- Relations with foreign Jews 24, 99,
101
- Religiosity 173–4, 177–9, 183–9,
191–4, 195, 200–1, 203–6,

- Anglo-Jewry (*cont.*)
 208, 219, 220–1, 222–3, 233, 260
 Anglo-Judaism 180–1, 189, 214, 217–220, 260, 261
 Hebrew usage 185, 188, 195–6, 197, 261
 Jewish Mission 215–17, 258
 Liberal 249–50
 Orthodox 143, 152, 167, 178–9, 181–3, 206, 219
 Proselytizing, *see* Conversion
 in Provincial congregations 189–91
 Reform 40–3, 140, 143, 152, 167, 181–3, 205, 208, 219, 221–2
 Return 212–15, 249
 of Women 201–4
 Resettlement 26–7, 49, 206
 Socio-economic patterns 226–9, 235–8, 257
- Anti-Semitism 213–4
 in Britain 13, 15–17, 29–30, 44, 62–4, 98–9, 216, 243–5, 246, 250, *see* Bulgarian Agitation; and *see* Eastern Question
 in Europe 128, 132, 243
 in Germany 64, 244
 in Ireland 128–9
 ‘of tolerance’ 16, 260
- Artom, Benjamin *Haham* 171, 183, 203, 216
- Austria 101, 161, 163
- Authorised Daily Prayer Book 179–80
- Balfour Declaration 12
- Bayswater Synagogue 114, 183
- Benisch, Abraham 194, 204
- Berlin, Isaiah 1
- Beth Din* 172, 177–8, 190
- Bevis Marks Synagogue 42, 115, 120, 183, 201, 205 *see also* Spanish and Portuguese Congregation
- Board of Deputies of British Jews 27 n., 39–40, 67, 74, 76, 125–7, 148, 150, 169, 242n., 259
- Anti-Jewish defamation 127–130
 and Communal Governance 109, 114, 133, 137, 142–4, 151–4, 166–7
- Conjoint Foreign Committee 121, 154, 156, 169
- History of 109–10
- Law, Parliamentary and General Purposes Committee 121, 130, 134, 138, 140
- and Marriage 113, 137–142
- Operation and organization 113–17, 119–24, 146, 148
- Presidents of, 117–9, 204 *see also* Moses Montefiore
- Protecting Anglo-Jewish interests 124–5, 130–4
 Factory Legislation 134–7
- and Reform Judaism 42–3, 116, 120, 143, 182
- Support for foreign Jews 144–8, 149, 155–6, 157–160, 162, 165, 167–8
- Bonaparte, Napoleon 7
- Borough Synagogue 114
- Britain 10, 21, 28, 199
 Attitude toward Jews 24, 29, 64, 67, 97, 102, 105, 127–130, 131–3, 161, 258, 261–2
- Britishness 13, 41, 48, 97–9, 215, 244–5, 248, 251, 258, 263
- Christianity of 44–6, 72–3, 97, 171, 183, 188, 203, 209, 212–13, 216, 220–2
- Conceptions of race 98–99, 208, 244–5
- Culture 10, 13
- Foreign affairs 89–91, 93–4, 96–7, 102–3, 155, 163–5, 167
- Jews of, *see* Anglo-Jewry
- Ireland, *see* Home Rule
- Politics and political parties 35, 44–5, 69, 78–80, 82–3, 86, 97, 125, 131, 251
- Religious pluralism 29, 74, 111–12
- Society 14, 40, 116, 171, 196, 202–3, 231, 242
- Bulgarian Agitation 85, 87, 94, 97, 99, 101–4, 108, 128, 154, 243, 259, *see also* Eastern Question

- Catholics 10, 31, 36, 222, 245n.
 Central Synagogue 120
Chambers Journal 127
 Charles (II) 26, 27, 206
 Chartism 10
 Chief Rabbinate 39–40, 143–4,
 172–3, 176–7, 189–90
 Church of England 70, 77, 180, 220–1
 Disestablishment, question of 73–4,
 107
 Churchill, Randolph 57
 Clermont-Tonnerre, Count de 48
 Cohen, Arthur 54, 55–6, 57, 92,
 95–6, 204, 236
 Representing Jewish interests 68,
 159
 Representing Southwark 60, 92
 and Russian persecution 102–5
 Cohen, Benjamin 117, 242n.
 Cohen, Lionel 65, 66, 73, 82, 88, 92,
 151–2, 193, 234, 235
 Orthodoxy of 177–8, 185
 Conversion 65n., 208, 216, *see also*
 London Society for Promoting
 Christianity among the Jews
 by Jews 206–8
 of Jews 29, 202, 209–12
 Cousinhood, the 19–20, 206, 241,
 249
 Crémieux, Adolphe 54, 150n., 161
 Cromwell, Oliver 26, 27, 206
 Crool, Joseph 32
- Daily Telegraph* 85
 Derby, Lord (Edward Stanley) 45, 147,
 153
 Dilke, Charles Wentworth 66n., 81,
 91n., 102
 Disraeli, Benjamin 32 n., 67, 86, 88,
 98
 Association with the Rothschilds 80,
 87
 Dissenters, *see* Nonconformists
 Dohm, Wilhelm von 68
- Eastern Question 85, 86, 87, 93–6,
 97–9, 153, 156, 243, 245, 259
 Edward (I) 26
 Edward, Albert, Prince of Wales 236
 Elementary Education Act 76–8, 107
 Emancipation 4–9, 19, 40, 48, 68
 in Britain *see* Anglo-Jewry,
 Dutch Jewry 6–7
 in France 6–8, 48
 in Germany 6–9, 38
 Revolutionary 6
 in Russia 7–8
 Tutelary 6, 9
 Escott, T.H.S. 236
 Evangelical Alliance, the 96, 97
- Factory and Workshop Acts 69–70
 Fawcett, Henry 75
 Federation of Synagogues 241–2
 Foreign Office 118, 145, 147–8, 154,
 155, 157–164, 167, 212
 France 6, 8, 161, 163
 Freeman, E. A. 98, 245
 Freud, Sigmund 1
- George (III) 109, 125
 Germany 6, 89, 101, 163, 196n.
 Gladstone, William 45, 56n., 69,
 75–6, 79, 85, 88n., 91, 95, 97,
 102–4, 125, 163
Globe 128
 Goldsmid, Francis Henry 31, 53, 58,
 59, 64, 66, 67, 76n. 77, 78, 79,
 95, 156, 162
 Representing Jewish interests 68, 69,
 72, 101n., 102n.
 Support for foreign Jews 100, 155–6
 Goldsmid, Frederick 54, 66
 Goldsmid, Isaac Lyon 32, 35, 43
 Goldsmid, Julian 66, 88n., 91, 92–3,
 95n.
 Representing Rochester 63–4
 Graetz, Heinrich, Prof. 254–5
 Great Synagogue 43 n., 116, 187,
 213
 Greenberg, Leopold 241
 Guadalla, Haim 181
- Hambro Synagogue 179, 188
 Harris, Henry 120
 Hartog, Numa 75n.
Haskalah 8
 in Britain 28–9
 Hazlitt, William 47
 Herschell, Solomon, Chief Rabbi 33
 Hirsch, Samson Raphael 8
 Historical Sources 22–3
 Historiography:
 Anglo-Jewish 11–7, 254–5

- Historiography: (*cont.*)
 on Anglo-Jewish
 emancipation 10–11
 on Anglo-Jewish religiosity 173–4,
 184
 on the Board of Deputies 110–12
 on European Jewish
 emancipation 6–8
 Jewish 12
 on Jewish MPs 51–2
 Hobson, J. A. 99
 Holdheim, Samuel 8
 Home Rule 81, 91–3
- Identity 2
 British 44–6, 48
 Jewish 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 38, 49, *see*
 also Anglo-Jewry, Identity
- Immigration 14, 263
 Anti-Alienism 11, 99, 224, 243
 Jewish 3, 15, 20, 31, 41 n., 242–3
- Inglis, Robert 44
 Isaac, Saul 54, 66, 77, 82
 Representing Nottingham 58
 Isaacs, Lewis 54, 66, 82, 92
 Israel, Henry 117
 Israel, Menassah Ben, Rabbi 26
- Jacoby, James 54, 73, 81, 91
 Representing Mid-Derbyshire 57–8
 James (II) 26
 Jessel, George 54, 66, 90, 126, 130,
 131, 152
 Jewish Association for the Diffusion of
 Religious Knowledge 200
 Jewish Association for the Removal of
 Civil and Religious Disabilities 36
 Jewish Board of Guardians 117, 133,
 169n., 202, 210, 228–9, 230–5,
 239
Jewish Chronicle 22, 76, 237–8, 250
 on the Board of Deputies 116, 119,
 121, 124, 129, 146, 148, 151,
 168
 on Jewish issues in British
 politics 67, 69, 70–1, 95, 104,
 125, 134
 on Party politics 82, 84, 86–7, 88
 on Religiosity and religious
 organisation 170, 176–7,
 178–9, 185, 188, 191–2, 203,
 204–5, 218, 260
- Jewish Historical Society of
 England 13, 254
 Jewish Members of Parliament 50–1,
 53, 54, 58, 64–5, 73, 78–9, 81,
 89, 91, 105–7, 257–258, 259
 Attainments of 56, 57
 Attitude to foreign affairs 89–91
 and Constituency politics 58, 59,
 105
 Jewishness of 65–6, 81–2, 100
 and Party politics 79, 82, 90, 92–3,
 102–3, 105
 Prejudice against 62–4
 Representation of the Jewish
 community 67–8, 69, 71–2,
 75–6, 105–7, 130–1, 134
 Support for foreign Jews 99–102,
 103–5
Jewish Quarterly Review 254–5
 Jewish Relief Act 9–10, 30, 31, 35
 Jewish Tailors Benefit Society 135, 136
Jewish World 23 n., 67, 73, 84, 92,
 179, 191, 238
- Jewry, *see also* Anglo-Jewry
 Ashkenazim 27 n.,
 Communities, types of 5, 7, 27–8,
 38, 124
 Diaspora 12
 Enlightenment, *see Haskalah*
 Equality 7, 87, *see also* Emancipation
 Existence 3, 5, 8, 257, *see also*
 Identity, Jewish
 French 8, 30, 150n.,
 German 8, 30, 196, 215n.
 Jewishness 2, 3, 4, 7, 13, *see also*
 Identity, Jewish
 Judaism, (types of) 3, 5, 8, 41
 Moroccan 145
 Palestinian 147n., 213–4
 Persian 147
 Romanian 100, 156–162
 Russian 7, 103–4, 212, 224
 Sephardim 7 n., 27 n., 204
 Serbian 100, 145–6, 153
 Turkish, *see* Bulgarian Agitation; and
 see Eastern Question
- Jews' College 185–6, 187–8, 199
 Jews' Free School 37, 196–8, 202,
 240
 Jews' Hospital 117
 Jews' Literary and Scientific
 Institution 38–9
 Joseph, N. S. 177, 214, 243

- Karaites 41, 192
- Landau, Hermann 241
- Layard, Austin 126, 147
- Liverpool Old Synagogue 188
- London 20, 50, 60
- London Society for Promoting
Christianity among the Jews 209,
211, 212
- Löwy, Albert 205, 208
- Macauley, Thomas Babington 46–7,
260
- Magnus, Philip 117
- Manchester Hebrew
Congregation 138, 141
- Manchester Jewish Board of
Guardians 139
- Marks, David Woolf, Prof. 182, 202,
207, 216, 218
- Marriage to a deceased wife's sister,
issue of 70–2
- Matrimonial Clauses Act 34, 69
- Mayhew, Henry 36
- Mendelssohn, Moses 8
- Metropolitan Internment Bill 34
- Minorities 11, 194, 263
- Mitchell, Joseph 36 n., 38
- Modernity 2, 5, 8, 34, 165, 263
Impact in Europe 3–4, 7
Jews and 4, 7, 12, 31, 42, 173, 259,
261–2, 264
- Montagu, Samuel 55–6, 73, 78, 81,
91, 152, 178, 201, 241, 250
on Party politics 82–3, 88
Representing Jewish interests 68
Representing Whitechapel 57, 59,
65, 66
- Montefiore, Claude Goldsmid 208,
249–50
- Montefiore, Joseph Mayer 118, 120
- Montefiore, Moses 17, 34, 122, 129,
143, 150n., 155, 163, 165, 182,
230, 236, 251, 262
Attitude to emancipation 33, 35
Missions abroad 97, 117, 119, 126,
145, 157–8, 164, 213
President of the Board of
Deputies 40, 43, 117–9, 167
- Morocco 101, 117, 122, 164, 165
- Mortara Affair 96–7, 149, 165–6
- New Central Synagogue 201
- New Synagogue 114–15, 120, 187
- New West End Synagogue 179, 183
- Nonconformists 48, 71, 74, 94n.,
95n., 106–7, 123, 208, 221
Emancipation of 30–1, 36
Influence on Jewish MPs 59–60
Politics of 59, 73–4, 75–6, 77, 86,
94, 97
- Oppenheim, Morris 11, 151–2
- Oven, Bernard van 32
- Oven, Joshua van 32
- Palestine 12, 145n.
- Parliament 9, 29, 72, 101–4, 172
- Parliamentary Oaths Act 9 n.
- Peel, Robert 43
- Persia 119, 122
- Phillips, Benjamin 117, 127
- Poor Jews' Temporary Shelter 241–2
- Post-Emancipation Era 2, 24, 49, 96,
124, 224, 251–2, 255, 256, 264
- Promissory Oaths Act 10 n.
- Proselytise, *see* Conversion
- Raynal, David 54
- Reform Act (1867) 79, 81, 86, 97
- Ressentiment* 4–5
- Romania 101, 154, 157–163
- Roth, Cecil 13–4
- Rothschild, Anthony de 236
- Rothschild, family 52n., 80–1, 87–8,
90, 116, 204, 236
Political influence 55, 56, 58–9
Poor Parliamentary
performance 54–5
- Rothschild, Ferdinand de 55, 80–1,
90–1, 92–3
Representing Aylesbury 59
- Rothschild, Lionel de 34, 55, 78, 80,
87, 168
Election to Parliament 9 n., 36, 45,
50, 58
Representing Jewish interest 69,
150n., 162
- Rothschild, Mayer de:
Representing Hythe 56, 58, 62, 80
- Rothschild, Nathaniel de 55, 77,
87–8, 90, 92–3, 236
Representing Aylesbury 59, 60

- Russell, John 45, 147, 230n.
 Russia 101, 162–3
 Persecution of Jews 101–4, 242 *see*
 also Jewry, Russian
 Russo-Jewish Committee 104
- Sacks, Jonathan, Chief Rabbi 6
- Salomons, David 32, 34, 43 n., 53, 58,
 78, 89, 152, 168, 230n.
 Approach to emancipation 35–6,
 140
 and the Board of Deputies 116,
 142
 Representing Greenwich 56, 58,
 59–60, 62, 64
 Representing Jewish interests 68, 69,
 136, 150n., 142
- Saturday Review* 163
- Schloss, Solomon 120
- Sebag, Joseph 117, 120, 128
- Serbia 101, 155–6, 158, 160–1
- Simon, John 58, 66, 76, 81, 89, 91,
 106, 116
 on the Eastern Question 85, 95
 on Party politics 84, 85, 88
 Representing Dewsbury 60–1
 Representing Jewish interests 68,
 69–70, 71, 76–7, 130,
 131
 and Russian persecution 102–5
- Simon, Oswald J. 129, 215, 247
- Singer, Simeon 179–80, 192, 214
- Smith, Goldwin, Prof. 208, 243–4,
 247
- Solomon, Henry 120
- Spanish and Portuguese
 Congregation 109
- Spectator* 129
- Sydney, Algernon 177
- Tsar Alexander (II) 127
- United Synagogue 68, 133, 169,
 172–3, 179, 186, 187, 231–2
 Formation of 175–6, 177
- Universities:
 Abolition of tests 74–6, 130, 132–3
 Cambridge 9, 75
 Oxford 9, 132–3
 University College London 9, 185
- Victoria, Queen 127, 251–2
- Voice of Jacob* 23 n.
- Voltaire, 29
- West London Synagogue of British
 Jews 42, 181, 202–3, 205, 207–8
- Western Synagogue 42, 176
- Whitehall Conference 26
- Wissenschaft des Judentums* 8
- Wolf, Lucien 246
- Woolf, Stuart 53, 66
- Worms, Henry de 54, 56, 61, 62, 79,
 82, 94, 152–3, 204
 Imperialist politics 88, 90, 92
 Representing Greenwich 62–2, 90
 Representing Jewish interests 68
 and Russian persecution 101–5
- Zangwill, Israel 181
- Zionism:
 Political 3, 248–9
 Religious 214